THE AMERICAN BAPTIST MISSION TO GERMAN-AMERICANS: A CASE STUDY OF ATTEMPTED ASSIMILATION

A dissertation by

Eric Henry Ohlmann

presented to

The Faculty of the

Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

Berkeley, California

March 1973

Committee Signatures:

Elden G. Ernst

Chairman

XUM

PREFACE

This is a case study of Anglo-American Protestant efforts to win and assimilate foreign-speaking people, and the particular case selected for investigation is the American Baptist mission to German-Americans.

Several factors have contributed to the investigator's interest in this subject. Prominent among these is the fact that he has been a member in churches belonging to both of the Baptist fellowships focused upon in this case study and thus developed an interest in their past, present, and possible future relationships. A preliminary perusal of some of the relevant primary sources further revealed that the past relationship of these two bodies involved the problem of Americanization and the many fascinating issues related to it. In addition, it was discovered that the case study unwittingly selected was actually excellent for an analysis of Anglo-American home missions to foreign-speaking people because the American Baptist Home Mission Society was engaged in the largest ministry of this kind in the country and, like the Methodists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians, conducted its largest mission among German-Americans. These considerations combined with the importance of such an investigation for the history of American Christianity (see the introduction) finalized the decision to proceed with this subject.

Since this research project involved a German denomination, vital primary sources were in that language. To make his findings readily

XUM

accessible to the English reader, however, the investigator has translated all quotations from these sources into English and in so doing attempted to represent the thought of the original as accurately as possible.

I am most indebted and grateful to my wife, Eunice, for her persistent support and for typing the final copy. Recognition is also certainly in place for my son, Brent, who patiently bore the deprivations of a family whose father is preoccupied with researching and writing a major piece of work.

I also wish to express sincere appreciation to my dissertation committee, which readily approved the prospectus for this project and encouraged my continued research. But particular recognition is due to the chairman of the committee, Dr. Eldon G. Ernst, and to Dr. Leonard J. Trinterud for valuable guidance and counselling while the dissertation was in progress, which contributed to a better organized and more articulate final copy. The willing services of several libraries has also been greatly appreciated. Among these are the libraries of the American Baptist Seminary of the West (Berkeley campus), the Graduate Theological Union, Pacific School of Religion, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, and Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I. EVOLVING PATTERNS OF MOTIVATION AND OPERATION 1839-1863

Chapter

1. LAUNCHING THE MISSION 21

2. AMERICAN BAPTIST MOTIVES FOR THE MISSION: EVANGELIZATION . . 36

3. AMERICAN BAPTIST MOTIVES FOR THE MISSION: AMERICANIZATION . . 49

PART II. THE MIDDLE PERIOD, 1863-1893

4. THE PATTERN OF MOTIVATION CONTINUED 88

5. GROWTH THROUGH COOPERATION 110

6. THE GERMAN BAPTISTS ALSO BECOME AMERICANS 131

PART III. THE DRIFT TOWARD INDEPENDENCE, 1893-1940

7. ACCEPTING GERMAN-AMERICANS AS PARTNERS 168

8. PARTNERS IN MISSIONS 199

9. AMERICANIZED BUT NOT ASSIMILATED 217

BIBLIOGRAPHY 259

ABBREVIATIONS

ABHMS An. Rep.	Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the American Baptist Home Mission Society.
ABPS An. Rep.	American Baptist Publication Society Annual Report.
App.	Appendix.
BHMM	The Baptist Home Mission Monthly.
DS	Der Sendbote.
NYBUME An. Rep.	New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education Annual Report.
Verh. (E)	Die östlichen Konferenz deutscher Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nordamerika. Verhandlungen.
Verh. (Gen.)	Die deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nord Amerika. Verhandlungen der Bundes-Konferenz.
Verh. (JK)	Die deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nordamerika. Verhandlungen der Jahres-Konferenz.
Verh. (W)	Die Konferenz von deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden des Westens. Verhandlungen.

INTRODUCTION

On account of the continuous, and at times massive, immigration to the United States since 1820, American churches constantly have been faced with the formidable task of securing and assimilating new Americans. The story of their efforts in that direction is an intriguing and vital chapter in the history of American Christianity. Complex motives were usually involved, various approaches to the problem were attempted, numerous difficulties were encountered, and varying results experienced. American Christianity and its institutions still vividly reflect the successes achieved and the failures encountered. Yet much of the story remains untold.

One of the largest efforts by an Anglo-American Protestant denomination to win and assimilate a foreign-speaking people was the American Baptist[1] mission to German-Americans. Beginning in 1839 and continuing on for about a century, American Baptists attempted to evangelize German-Americans,[2] to win their adherence to Baptist beliefs,

---

[1]Because Southern Baptists only contributed in a small way to home missions among the German Baptists, whenever the designation American Baptists is used in this study, it has reference only to the Baptists of the North (now known as the American Baptist Churches in the USA), unless otherwise indicated.

[2]By evangelizing was essentially meant the proclamation of the gospel in the hope of evoking faith in the forgiveness of God. Inasmuch as this response of faith was generally thought to involve a conscious conversion experience, evangelizing also meant bringing people to such an experience. Therefore, it was held that German Lutherans and Catholics who had not had such an experience needed to be evangelized as

to organize the converts and other Baptists from Germany into churches, financially to support the immigrants' own efforts at expansion, and to assimilate them into American life and the American Baptist denomination. Although the effort was ultimately thwarted in 1940, it remains one of the most significant ventures of its kind in American church history. Yet, as most Anglo-American Protestant missions to new Americans, it has not been thoroughly analyzed to determine all the factors involved. That is the object of this study.

Immigration has been a prominent factor in the history of all the countries of the western hemisphere. But the massiveness of the migration to the United States is without parallel not only in this part of the world but in the entire history of mankind. During the century preceding 1920 alone, nearly 35,000,000 aliens made their way to these shores.[1] Since they came in an uneven flow, it was not uncommon for their number to exceed 500,000 a year, and during six years it even surpassed the million per year mark.

Thirty-five million is only a small fraction of the present population. But, according to one estimate, the foreign-born and those of foreign or mixed (one foreign and one native) parentage constituted 32.3 percent of the total white population of the United States in 1870.

---

well. The American Baptists' motives for evangelizing German-Americans changed over the years, and those changes will be indicated in this study, but the meaning of evangelism remained basically the same.

[1]Carl Wittke, We Who Built America: The Saga of the Immigrant. (Ann Arbor, Mich.: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1939), p. xvi.

By 1910 that figure had increased to 39.4 per cent.[1] When viewed from that perspective, the immigration factor in American history can clearly be seen to have been of major significance.

Because the new Americans were unevenly distributed over the country, their proportion to the older American stock was even higher in certain geographical areas. As late as 1907 about 95 per cent of the newcomers were still making their homes in the northern and western states.[2] Until 1890 they tended to mass into the western states. From 1881 to 1884 two-thirds of them settled west of Lake Michigan and north of the thirty-eighth degree latitude.[3] After 1890 the center of concentration began to shift to the Northeast. By 1916, 77.1 per cent of the immigrant population was to be found east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio. 68.9 per cent of it was concentrated into the six states of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois alone, which represented only 5.6 per cent of the land area of the United States.[4] As a result, in 1906 the foreign-born and their immediate descendants outnumbered the native-born in nineteen of the northern states,[5] and ten years later they constituted 59 per cent of the entire population of New England.[6]

---

[1]Jeremiah W. Jenks and W. Jett Lauck, The Immigration Problem (3rd ed., rev.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1913), p. 524.

[2]Executive Board, Annual Report of the American Baptist Home Mission Society (New York: A.B.H.M.S., 1907), p. 58.

[3]Ibid., 1884, p. 18. [4]Ibid., 1916, p. 82.

[5]Howard B. Grose, Aliens or Americans? (New York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1906), p.236.

[6]ABHMS An. Rep., 1916, p. 82.

In some cities the ratio was even more startling. With growing industrialization, the exhaustion of good farmland, and the shift from the old to the new immigration, the newcomers increasingly gravitated to urban centers. By 1915, 75 per cent of them were located in the large cities.[1] Long before this trend had reached its height, the census of 1880 indicated that those of foreign-birth and parentage accounted for 61 per cent of Cincinnati's population, 69 per cent of Cleveland's, 70 per cent of Boston's, 88 per cent of New York's, and 91 per cent of Chicago's.[2] Because of a simultaneous migration of the native-born population from rural areas to urban centers, admittedly these percentages did not increase much during the following years. But it was increasingly eastern cities which showed the highest ratio of immigrants to the total population.

The immigrants also had a tendency to settle in ethnic groups. As a result, ethnic quarters evolved in most cities, and rural districts and towns developed which were as foreign to the native American, as far as speech and social customs were concerned, as a province in Germany or a village in Italy. Both numerically and culturally, therefore, the new Americans were often the dominant segment of the population.

In spite of their numbers, concentration in certain geographical regions, and ethnic cohesiveness, however, they had to be assimilated into American society and institutions, unless the United States was to become what Marcus L. Hansen has called a "patchwork nation of foreign

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., 1886, p. 29.

settlements."[1] Most immigrants may have preferred to isolate themselves in ethnic groups and to perpetuate their peculiar national characteristics and institutions indefinitely. Native Americans,[2] however, could not accept such an arrangement. With the rise of nationalism after the War of Independence, they increasingly resented any threats to their institutions by pockets of foreign[3] influence and power in the country. Their basically Anglo-American conception of America's mission and destiny--especially after the Civil War--further required the assimilation of all carriers of foreign cultures. And later their ideals of a superior race, produced by the fusion of the races, and their concept of a homogeneous social order necessitated the Americanization and amalgamation of the newcomers.

The problem of assimilating these new arrivals into America's religious institutions[4] was greatly alleviated by the establishment of religious liberty: not everyone needed to be brought into conformity with the same ecclesiastical tradition. The major American denominations, moreover, had been transplanted from across the Atlantic. Since the large majority of immigrants continued to come from Europe, where most

---

[1]Marcus L. Hansen, The Immigrant in American History, Harper Torchbook, ed. by Arthur M. Schlesinger (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1940), p. 132.

[2]Only the Indians can properly be referred to as native Americans. But as used here, it refers to persons of older American stock, that is, at least older than first or second generation Americans.

[3]By foreign was usually meant non-Anglo-American.

[4]There are various criteria for the designation American denomination. Reference is made here to indigenous denominations and those begun during the colonial days and organized under American ecclesiastical authority after the War of Independence.

of them already had had some affiliation with these churches, they could remain within the same ecclesiastical tradition after arriving in this country.

Nevertheless, even in the case of immigrants who retained their denominational affiliation, the process of assimilation was fraught with problems. The immigrants' affiliation with a church abroad did not assure their continued relationship with its equivalent in America. Large numbers of the European immigrants abandoned their churches before leaving their homeland, some did so in the course of their migration, and others settled in communities where a church of their choice had not yet been founded. Even those who remained loyal to their denomination were not easily incorporated into its American counterpart. A few European churches, such as the Lutheran and Reformed, had spread into several countries and established as many independent national organizations. When emigrants from those nations converged on America, they all naturally wished to worship in their mother tongue and to retain their peculiar religious customs. In addition, denominational theologies had evolved variously in the different countries (even within individual countries), causing further divisiveness. Certain economic, social, and geographical factors in America added to the tensions. As a result, large numbers of these people could not even be incorporated into the American counterparts of the churches to which they belonged abroad.

For Anglo-American denominations[1] to assimilate non-English

[1]Such as the Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians.

speaking immigrants, was even more difficult. In the first place, the assimilation of these people usually involved evangelizing primarily infidels, apostates, or dissenters, and recruiting those who for other reasons had severed their ties with the churches in which they had been baptized. Many of them had come to America precisely to gain religious, political, and economic freedom and resisted any associations which might involve new restraints. Others were repulsed by American evangelistic methods. All of them had to be won to ecclesiastical structures and theological views which were strange to them. And, above all, there was the almost insurmountable problem of the language barrier.

Some converts were made and proselytes won in spite of these obstacles. But fully assimilating them into Anglo-American denominations often proved to be more difficult than securing their membership. All of the immigrants had come with certain foreign allegiances, political leanings, religious customs, and cultural values, some of which were considered to be undesirable in America or even irreconcilable with its institutions and social values. The Anglo-American denominations, on the other hand, were constituted principally of native Americans who cherished their country's heritage and were apprehensive about foreign influences upon the country. Bringing the two together required much effort and tact, at best, and often failed, resulting in numerous foreign-speaking branches of American denominations.

The proliferation of these denominations became a major factor in the shaping of American religion. As late as 1945 the Yearbook of

American Churches listed thirty-seven denominations with a foreign nationality or language designated in their names[1]--not to mention those which had dropped these designations but still remained essentially ethnic organizations. And the task of assimilating them is still far from complete.[2]

To determine how this process might be completed requires knowledge and understanding of its history. Yet all the factors involved have not been sufficiently analyzed. For instance, What were the true motives of the assimilating institutions? What techniques did they use and with what results? Did their institutional structure make a difference? What ethnic attitudes advanced or hindered the work? Why did some denominations succeed while others failed? To what extent were political, economic, social and other factors involved? Because the development of religion in America was so profoundly affected by these issues, they deserve further investigation.

As already indicated, it is not the purpose of this study to survey the entire subject of Christian missions to immigrants in America. Surveys have their place, but they must always rely upon more definitive examinations of the subjects they cover. Since there is a paucity of such in-depth sources in this instance, the greater need at

---

[1]Benson Y. Landis, ed. (Lebanon, Pa.: Sowers Printing Company, 1945), pp. 5-86.

[2]Twenty-seven denominations with foreign nationality or language designations still remained in 1969. Those that have dropped the designation but are for one reason or other principally ethnic group would probably more than double the number.

the present is for a few case studies to ascertain the truth or falsity of the generalizations which have been made and to provide a solid base for a future survey. This study, therefore, is a more limited undertaking, being confined to an inquiry into the American Baptist mission to German-Americans.

The American Baptist mission to new Americans was one of the largest ministries of its kind in the country. The American Baptist Home Mission Society (ABHMS) alone worked among as many as twenty-six foreign-speaking nationalities in a given year,[1] engaging up to 377 missionaries. Of all of these, its mission to German Americans was the largest.[2] Yet, no adequate historical inquiry has been made into this significant and interesting attempt to assimilate foreign-speaking people into an Anglo-American denomination.

For the most part, American Baptist historians have made only brief references to the subject.[3] Lawrence B. Davis probably came closest to the concerns at hand in his study of "The Baptist Response to Immigration in the United States, 1880-1925."[4] But, whereas Davis was

---

[1]These figures do not include its Latin-American, Indian, and Negro missions.

[2]Only if the Scandinavian Baptists in America were grouped together did they exceed the Germans in number. They had, however, divided into separate conferences.

[3]As for example in Albert H. Newman, ed., A Century of Baptist Achievement (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1901); Charles L. White, A Century of Faith (Philadelphia: The Judson Press for the American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1932). See also Edwin S. Gaustad, "Themes for Research in American Baptist History," Foundations, VI (April, 1963), 160.

[4](Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968).

primarily concerned with America's immigration policies and how they were affected by the nativism of American Protestants like the American Baptists, this study is essentially about the institutional assimilation of a foreign-speaking people into an American religious denomination. As will be indicated, the two issues were very closely interrelated, but they are clearly two different subjects, and the latter involves many factors besides nativism. Secondly, whereas Davis examined the attitudes of American Baptists to immigrants generally, this case study is specifically about their attitudes and relationship to German-Americans, which were significantly different from their attitudes to the new immigration during the period 1880-1925. Moreover, whereas Davis focused on the American Baptists, this investigation will examine, in addition, the responses of those who constituted the other half of the relationship. Lastly, Davis' study covers only about half of the time period that American Baptists were courting the German-Americans.

Those who have researched the history of the German Baptists in America[1] (now known as the North American Baptist General Conference) have similarly provided only a bare outline of our subject. The first English history of the conference,[2] published in 1924, included some

---

[1]The German Baptists in American have been variously known as Deutschen Gemeinden getaufter Christen (gewöhnlich Baptisten genannt), 1851-71; Deutschen getauften Christen Nordamerika's, 1871-83; Deutsche Baptisten in Nord Amerika or German Baptists in North America, 1883-98; Deutsch-Amerikanischer Baptisten Gemeinden, 1898-1944; and the North American Baptist General Conference, 1944-. In this study they will be generally referred to as the German Baptists, because that is the name they themselves used during most of the period under study, the one used in most of the sources, and one that is useful in distinguishing the two ethnic groups examined in this study.

[2]Albert J. Ramaker, The German Baptists in North America: An

helpful information. An up-dated and expanded history, published in 1944,[1] added a few more details. But both of these books were intended for popular use and are therefore basically promotional in character. They include only a very limited amount of analytical and interpretative material, particularly in respect to the subject at hand. More recently Dr. Otto E. Krueger wrote another short history of the conference.[2] It was specifically prepared as a study course for laity, however, and is the least comprehensive of the three.

A complement to these general histories are the memoirs of George A. Schulte,[3] one time (1892-1916) secretary of the General Missionary Society of the German Baptists. They provide additional facts on the subject as well as some evaluation of them, based on personal involvement. Among the book's limitations, however, is the fact that it covers only the period of Schulte's own ministry (1863-1916) and that it is largely confined to activities in which he personally participated.

Because previous histories have for the most part ignored or neglected the concerns projected for this study, it is intended, firstly, as an extension of knowledge into hitherto unexplored areas of American

---

Outline of Their History (Cleveland: The German Baptist Publication Society, 1924). Prior to 1924 periodical articles treating aspects of the Conference's history had appeared but no systematic and comprehensive history.

[1]William Kuhn et. al., eds., These Glorious Years: The Centenary History of German Baptists of North America 1843-1943 (Cleveland: Roger Williams Press, n.d.).

[2]Otto E. Krueger, In God's Hand: The Story of the North American Baptist General Conference (Forest Park, Ill.: Roger Williams Press, 1958).

[3]George A. Schulte, Erinnerungen (Cleveland: Druck und Verlag des

church history.[1]

Such an investigation is indispensable to an adequate history of the German Baptists. The very existence of their conference and, for many years, much of their life was so closely interwoven with that of the American Baptists that any comprehensive history of the former must include a careful treatment of their relationship to the latter. Although the German Baptists, early in their history, became largely independent institutionally, their development can be understood only in light of their financial ties with their American brethren.

In light of the fact that the ABHMS maintained a ministry to as many as twenty-six nationalities within the United States alone, its mission to but one of these may appear as only a minute part of American Baptist history. The history of the denomination, however, has been largely one of home missions, and at times as many as one quarter of its home missionaries were engaged in ministries to foreign-speaking people. The German work, moreover, was much larger than all the others combined, the Swedish excepted. It was the first substantial home mission to a foreign-speaking people begun by the American Baptists and the one in which they developed most of their basic policies governing such missions. It also had considerable reverberation on the denomination through men like Walter Rauschenbusch, Conrad Moehlmann, Jacob Heinrich, William Lipphardt, and many others of only somewhat lesser influence.

Publikation-Vereins der deutschen Baptisten, n.d.).

[1]For this reason, also, the references are almost exclusively to primary sources.

The concerns of this study also extend beyond the two Baptist bodies directly involved. All major Anglo-American denominations in the United States have had some ministry to foreign-speaking people since the mid-nineteenth century, and all of them have had to deal with some of the same problems. Like the American Baptists, moreover, the former Methodist Episcopal Church (North), the Congregational Christian Churches, and the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America conducted by far their largest foreign-speaking work among the Germans. This investigation, therefore, is a case study of issues which directly affected all of these major American denominations and which have had a decisive part in shaping the religious institutions, thought, and practices of this country.

Despite the distinct prominence of these home mission ventures among German-Americans, the assimilation process involved has not been sufficiently analyzed. Denominational histories of varying quality have been written about the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed bodies in the United States which retained the bulk of German-Americans. But the evangelization and assimilation of others into Anglo-American denominations, constituted primarily of native Americans and without substantial counterparts in Germany, has not received the same amount of attention or quality of research. Because the latter involved different circumstances and many problems which the denominations whose members were for the most part transplanted from parent churches in Germany did not encounter, it requires separate analysis. It is with that type of situation that this study is primarily concerned and on which it is intended to shed

more light.

As in the case of the German Baptists, histories of other home mission projects among German-Americans neglected or inadequately treated the problem of their assimilation into American religious life and institutions. In his history of the German Congregational Churches in the United States,[1] George Eisenach was particularly concerned to indicate the causes which contributed to the origin and growth of those churches. References to the problems of Americanization and assimilation are only very brief and factual: in the sense of lacking any analytical content. The entire book, in fact, is highly biographical and is little more than a chronicle, providing virtually no interpretative material.

H. Clifford Fox's German Presbyterians in the Upper Mississippi Valley[2] is not much more helpful. Besides being confined to a limited geographical area, it is primarily a history of the seminary and churches of the German Presbyterians and not of their relationship to the larger Presbyterian Churches in the United States of America of which they were a part. The few pages which deal with their struggle for separate presbyteries and a synod and their eventual reunion with the parent body, moreover, are limited to a discussion of ecclesiastical tensions, indicating very few relationships between these internal conflicts and the broader racial and cultural issues impinging upon them.

German Methodists have faired better at the hands of the historians.

---

[1]George J. Eisenach, A History of the German Congregational Churches in the United States (Yankton, S.D.: The Pioneer Press, 1938).

[2](Ypsilanti, Mich.: University Lithoprinters, 1942).

XUM

The Story of German Methodism[1] by Paul F. Douglass is a competent history of that denomination's home mission to the Germans. But in its treatment of the problem of assimilation, it suffers from some of the same limitations as Fox's book. It is a history of the German churches and is told from their perspective, rather than from that of the assimilating institution. As a result, it does not deal much with the mother-daughter relationship between the two groups. It does indicate some contributing factors to the eventual assimilation of the German churches, but because of the time at which it was written, it again does not deal sufficiently with the ethnic problems involved.

Even the broader subject of home missions to new Americans, generally, needs further examination and reinterpretation. During the first four decades of this century, a number of interdenominational studies were made of the subject.[2] They are still very valuable and illuminating analyses of the process of assimilation for the time at which they were written. But they lack a historical perspective. As a rule they are sociological analyses of their time and do not provide more than a sketch of the nineteenth century background to the problem. They have also beoome dated. Since the appearance of recent studies

---

[1](Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1939).

[2]Such as Howard B. Grose, Aliens or Americans? (New York: (American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1906); Charles A. Brooks, Christian Americanization: A Task for the Churches (N.p.: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1919); and Georgia E. Harkness, The Church and the Immigrants, Introduction by G. W. Tupper (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1921).

XUM

of ethnic conflicts in the United States,[1] it has become necessary to re-examine the attitudes of American churches to the immigrants (and vice versa) in the context of these broader ethnic cleavages which were prevalent in the country.

Recently, Johannes J. Mol did a valuable psychological and sociological study of the mutual effect of religion and immigrant adjustment.[2] It is a concise and helpful analysis of the religious factors which affect the integration of immigrants into native populations and of the effect of migration on the immigrant's religious beliefs and institutions. It, however, has one serious limitation for the student of religion in America. For, while it establishes universal sociological principles about the religious factors affecting the assimilation of immigrants into the religious life of their new homes, it does not examine how the political, economic, social, and cultural forces peculiar to the American scene affected the process here. His general principles, therefore, need to be incorporated into the context of American history and fleshed out with all the historical factors which made this scene unique.

Besides providing further evidence on a hitherto neglected subject

---

[1]Such as Oscar Handlin, The Uprooted (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951); Oscar Handlin, The American People in the Twentieth Century (2nd ed. rev.; Boston: Beacon Press, 1963); Thomas F. Gossett, Race: The History of an Idea in America (New York: Schocken Books, 1965); Ray A. Billington, The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1963); and John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955).

[2]"Churches and Immigrants: A Sociological Study of the Mutual Effect of Religion and Immigrant Adjustment," R.E.M.P. Bulletin, IX (May 1961), Supplement 5, pp. 6-76.

in the history of American Christianity, therefore, this study will suggest some new interpretations of certain facets of home missions to foreign-speaking people. The major such interpretation concerns the motivations of such missions. It will be demonstrated that Americanization[1] was already a powerful motivational factor for Anglo-American home missions to immigrants during the nineteenth century, even though it was not readily acknowledged till after the turn of the century and not widely promoted as a distinctive home mission program until World War I. During most of the nineteenth century, Americanization was believed to automatically follow evangelization and was so closely identified with the latter that it remained partially concealed under that larger umbrella. The resultant impression is that the conversion of souls was clearly the primary motive and Americanization a secondary consideration or desirable consequence. The fact is that Americanization was a much stronger motivation than has been generally recognized, or at least acknowledged.

It will be shown, on the other hand, that precisely when American Protestants recognized that Americanization did not automatically follow evangelization and distinctive programs of Americanization were being devised to supplement the evangelization of new Americans, these programs were primarily intended for the new immigration from southern and eastern Europe. Because of changing patterns in American nativism, members of the old immigration from northern and western Europe were then regarded as

---

[1]Concepts of what Americanization entailed were to change with changing nativistic fears, theories of race, and so forth. But basically it meant bringing new Americans to an appreciation and patriotic acceptance of American values and institutions.

XUM

less threatening to American culture and even accepted as fellow Nordics and partners in the defense of American-Teutonic culture rather than subjects of Americanization.

Most treatments of home missions in America have accentuated the evangelistic motive in the nineteenth century and programs of Americanization after 1914 but entirely missed, or only dimly perceived, the forceful undercurrents and countercurrents being disclosed here. In any case, these themes still need to be clearly identified and fully demonstrated. That is seen as the principal interpretative function of this case study.

Accordingly, this study is divided into three major parts. The first deals with the development of motivational and operational patterns leading up to the launching of the mission and during its formative years, the second with growth and progress toward assimilation during the years when Americanization was still a major motivating factor, and the third with the shift in motivational patterns and the gradual German Baptist drift away from the American Baptists and into an entirely separate denominational existence.

In short, then, this is a case study of Anglo-American home missions to foreign-speaking people. Accordingly, it is not intended as an analysis of all Christian missions to new Americans, on the one hand, nor as a definitive history of German Baptists in America, on the other. Instead, it is primarily an investigation into the kinds of factors and issues which were involved in efforts by Anglo-American denominations to win and assimilate foreign-speaking people. And its significance is

XUM

basically two-fold. It provides new evidence in a hitherto neglected area of American Christianity (particularly about the two groups on whom the case study focuses) and offers a new interpretation of the motivation for American Baptist home missions to the immigrants (and one which will undoubtedly also be discovered to have wide application to all Anglo-American denominations involved in similar endeavors).[1]

[1]For a description of the major primary sources see the bibliographical essay.

XUM

PART I

EVOLVING PATTERNS OF MOTIVATION AND OPERATION

1839-1863

CHAPTER I

LAUNCHING THE MISSION

In 1839 the Pennsylvania Baptist Convention appointed Rev. Konrad A. Fleischmann, a German pastor, to minister to the Germans in its state;[1] in late 1845 or early 1846 the American Baptist Publication Society employed David Rothen, a licentiate, as a missionary and colporteur among the Germans in Ohio;[2] and in June of 1846 the ABHMS commissioned Rev. Johann Eschmann as a missionary to the Germans in New York city and Newark, New Jersey.[3] Thus the American Baptist mission to German-Americans was launched.

In the following years it took the shape of evangelizing German-Americans, winning their acceptance of Baptist beliefs, helping to organize the converts into congregations, publishing German literature, and especially providing financial assistance for the support of pastors, the training of ministers, and the employment of colporteurs.

Only about one-fifth to one-quarter of the 3,193 German Baptists in

---

[1] Der Sendbote, May 8, 1889, p. 5; Schulte, op. cit., p. 3.

[2] J. Newton Brown, History of the American Baptist Publication Society, From its Origin in 1824, to its Thirty-Second Anniversary in 1856 (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, n.d.), pp. 174-5.

[3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1847, p. 22.

America in 1863 had immigrated as Baptists.[1] The Baptist work in Germany was less than a decade older than its counterpart in America. It had grown more rapidly and by 1864 counted 10,979 members. But even if Baptists emigrated in larger numbers than Germans generally (because of religious persecution and economic hardships), they could not contribute substantial numbers to the newer work. Moreover, possibly more than half of those who did immigrate to America were lost to the German Baptist churches by settling beyond their reach.[2] The growth of the mission, therefore, depended primarily upon converting other German-Americans to the Christian faith and/or bringing them into Baptist churches.

Because of the language-barrier, this task of evangelization had to be performed largely by the Germans themselves. American Baptists, nevertheless, contributed to the mission in a variety of ways. To a limited extent their churches were instrumental in the conversion of Germans to the faith and/or to Baptist principles. Even though the language-barrier prevented them from reaching large numbers,[3] it was through contact with their congregations and pastors that all of the

---

[1] Home Mission Record, May 1857, p. 18. This ratio is based on an estimate made in 1857. But there is no reason to suspect an increase in the ratio between 1857 and 1863. If anything it may have dropped because of the decline of German immigration during those years.

[2] Die Konferenz von deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden des Westens. Verhandlungen (n.p., 1870), p.20; DS, Dec. 4, 1867, p. 186. Some joined American Baptist churches, but an indeterminate number also affiliated themselves with other denominations.

[3] No figures are available, but indications suggest that the number was only a small percentage of the whole.

early leaders of the German Conference were converted and/or brought into the Baptist fold.[1]

To a larger extent they served as seed-plots for German churches. Throughout this period, German Baptist immigrants often settled in communities which had American Baptist, but no German Baptist, churches.[2] Not infrequently, they then joined the former until their number warranted a congregation of their own or until they secured a German pastor.

Where the work was done by German Baptists themselves it was frequently financed by American Baptists. German Baptist colporteurs, for instance, were appointed and commissioned by the American Baptist Publication Society.[3] Beginning with one such employee in 1846, the Society gradually increased the number to about fifteen by 1856. Thereafter, however, the number was rapidly reduced and after 1860 this facet of the mission was entirely discontinued.

Although they were never numerous and the period of their activity was limited to fifteen years, these German Baptist colporteurs rendered a significant service. By concentrating on communities without any

---

[1]It was through association with American Baptists that A. Fleischmann, J. Eschmann, A. Rauschenbusch, and C. Schoemaker became Baptists. A. Puttkammer and P. Bickel were converted in American Baptist churches and consequently became Baptists.

[2]Efforts were made to direct such immigration to communities with German Baptist churches, but they were largely unsuccessful.

[3]Some German Baptists were also employed as colporteurs by the American Tract Society. Because of this society's interdenominational stance, however, they were not permitted to advocate distinctively Baptist views.

churches, going from house to house conversing about religion, leaving tracts and books, conducting meetings and delivering sermons, baptizing, organizing Sunday schools and churches, and fostering those already existent, they served as valuable forerunners of home missionaries and pastors. In addition, they were heralds of the Baptist faith. Because most Germans still had only little or no knowledge of free churches, including Baptists, or had been highly prejudiced against them, colporteurs working among them not only made some converts and fostered the religious life of those beyond the reach of the ordinary means of grace, as their American counterparts, but also introduced them for the first time to Baptist beliefs and practices (at least as presented by Baptists themselves). In this respect, they were particularly useful precusors and adjuncts of the residential pastors during the early years of the German Baptist mission in America.

Similarly, many young congregations organized by the Germans received financial assistance to rent or build meeting places and to support their pastors. With but few exceptions their members belonged to the poorer classes. In addition, they were broadly scattered throughout the country, so that they were usually organized with a minimal number of charter members and required several years to become self-supporting. Some of their pastors helped to support themselves by engaging part-time in non-clerical occupations, but this practice was soon discontinued because of the need to devote all the available manpower to missionary and pastoral functions and because of an early emphasis on ministerial education and a professional clergy.[1]

---

[1]Early, that is, by Baptist standards.

It was the ABHMS that came to their aid at this point. From 1850 to 1863 the Society employed an average of four resident German Baptist pastors a year.[1] That amounted to less than one-sixth of the total number of German Baptist pastors in the country at that time. They were commissioned annually, however, and there was a considerable amount of rotation. As a result, most of them were employed by the Society at one time or another.[2]

The value of American Baptist assistance in this area is probably greater than what is suggested by these figures alone. Since the German Baptist churches were first being founded during these years and their members were poor, it was usually difficult or practically impossible for them to become financially established without outside aid. As late as 1870 only a minority of the churches had become self-supporting, and even the oldest ones were still unable to be of much assistance to the younger ones. At its first meeting in 1859, the Western Conference founded a mission society, which raised funds in the German churches to enable ministers to visit pastorless groups scattered about in its territory. In 1861 the Eastern Conference organized itself for the same purpose, and each conference engaged a few men in this capacity annually. But it was not until 1867 that the Eastern and two years later that the Western, Conference began to support resident pastors. So the new and needy con-

---

[1]These figures include the total number of missionaries commissioned, even though not all of them served for the entire year for which they were appointed.

[2]And, at least at times, the Society expressed its willingness to employ as many qualified pastors as the German churches could supply (DS, Dec. 1859, p. 70; ibid., Feb. 1860, p. 80.

XUM

gregations had to turn primarily to the Home Mission Society for help. A large majority of them, in fact, were organized by missionary pastors who were employed by the Society[1] and were receiving a part of their salary from it.

The New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education (NYBUME) went a step further by providing training for German Baptist candidates for the ministry. As early as 1851, when only a few German Baptist churches had been founded, while they were still only discovering each other's existence, and before they had had occasion to unite in any form of organization, Rev. Zenas Freeman, corresponding secretary of the Union, had recognized the need for a place where promising young men from these churches could obtain the training necessary to further the work among their countrymen in America.[2] After he and other "experienced and benevolent American brethren"[3] had consulted August Rauschenbusch, "the subject of organizing a department of Instruction especially adapted to the wants of the rising German ministry" at the newly founded (1850) University of Rochester and Rochester Theological Seminary was urged upon the attention of the latter's board.[4] Apparently, it was approved and "a committee was appointed to draw up a plan of organization and

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1867, p. 38.

[2] Walter R. Betteridge, Albert J. Ramaker, and Josiah R. Henderson, Rochester Theological Seminary General Catalogue, 1850 to 1900 (Rochester: E. R. Andrews, Printer, 1900), p. 214.

[3] DS, March 1860, p. 82.

[4] New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education, Annual Report with the Proceedings of the Annual Meetings (Rochester: n.p., 1852), p. 22.

prescribe a course of study."[1] When some German Baptist pastors and co-workers met to unite their churches by some bond of union two months later and many years before they would have been in the position to found a seminary on their own, they were informed that a course of studies was already designed for ministerial candidates from their churches and that the doors of Rochester Theological Seminary were open to them.[2]

After one year's operation, it was estimated that the German Department would require an endowment of at least fifteen thousand dollars.[3] Within another year, perceptive members of the Board had come to realize that in order to prepare ministerial candidates for useful service among Germans, they would need to be thoroughly instructed in their own language by a full-time German professor.[4] In anticipation of securing such a man, the endowment was raised to twenty thousand dollars.[5] Although less than four thousand of that amount had been raised by 1858, when August Rauschenbusch assumed the position, the Union undertook to pay his salary of seven hundred dollars a year. Only a few months later, the seminary found itself in difficult financial straits

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Die östlichen Konferenz deutscher Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nordamerika. Verhandlungen (n.p., 1851), p. 8.

[3] NYBUME An. Rep., 1852, p. 22. It was approved in 1854 (ibid., 1854, pp. 10-1).

[4] Ibid., 1853, p. 19; ibid., 1854, p. 21. The course of studies as originally prescribed was taught in English, and most German students arrived in Rochester with insufficient knowledge of the language to effectively participate in the courses offered.

[5] Ibid., 1855, pp. 20, 15.

and Freeman was removed by death. Because of the exigencies of the hour, his successor suggested that Rauschenbusch relinquish his post and let the German Department fold up. When Rauschenbusch flatly refused to do so, the proposal was dropped and the department continued.[1]

In addition to paying Rauschenbusch's salary, the NYBUME with assistance from the New Jersey Education Society and the Pennsylvania Education Society, also provided beneficiaries of seventy to one hundred dollars per year for most of the German students. After 1860 the German churches assumed some of this expense, but only a minimal amount. Books for the library were also purchased by the Union.

Similarly, the American Baptist Publication Society assisted in the publication of religious literature in German. By 1863 it had published at least four books, fifteen tracts,[2] and a German songbook.[3] Fearing that the membership of the German churches was too small to sustain its own religious paper, the Society's board advised postponing that project. But when the Germans proceeded with it anyhow, the Society raised two hundred dollars to found the paper and helped sustain it for a few years.[4] At least until 1855, it also published the reports of the

---

[1] DS, Nov. 13, 1895, p. 5. Although, when the Civil War began, Rauschenbusch was asked to solicit the funds necessary to cover his salary (ibid., Dec. 14, 1898, p. 793).

[2] American Baptist Publication Society. Annual Reports (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1856), pp. 103, 110.

[3] Ibid., 1855, p. 93.

[4] Verh. (E), 1859, p. 10; ABPS An. Rep., 1854, p. 51; ibid., 1856, p. 46.

annual German conferences.[1]

Lastly, individual American Baptist churches, associations, and state conventions contributed to the German mission. Although there is no systematic and complete record of their spontaneous giving, it must have been a sizable sum. It seems most of the German churches received some assistance in buying or building church edifices. And considering that some of them received as much as eight thousand dollars,[2] the amount contributed for this purpose alone may have exceeded that expended by the Publication Society. In addition, "cheerful and liberal assistance" was often made available to help support qualified pastors whose churches were unable to pay their entire salaries.[3]

Thus, in a short period of time, the exigencies of the situation had virtually dictated that the work of the mission would have to be done in the language of the people being addressed, necessitating the use of foreign-speaking workers and confining the role of the American Baptists primarily to that of a subsidizing agency. This was the basic approach that continued to be used in this mission and was adopted for missions to other foreign-speaking people as well.

The results of this approach in this case were relatively good. By 1863 the total membership of the German Baptist churches officially

---

[1] DS, Aug. 1855, p. 2.

[2] Which in those days paid for a sizable church. Schulte, J.A., "Geschichte der Ersten Deutschen Baptisten Gemeinde zu Philadelphia, Pa." (Philadelphia: n.p., 1893). p. 10. (Typewritten.)

[3] Home Mission Record, Dec. 1853, p. 10; DS, Dec. 1859, p. 70.

related to the two regional conferences was only 3,193, a minute fraction of all the German immigrants in America. As compared to the Congregational and Presbyterian missions among the Germans, however, the Baptist work had done well.

An evaluation of these evangelistic efforts must take into account the obstacles encountered. The task of making Baptists of German-Americans entailed almost insurmountable difficulties. Because the Baptist work in Germany was less than a decade older than its counterpart in America, a German Baptist was a novelty. And as soon as the existence of such people and their churches became known, they were associated with the Münster Anabaptists to excite prejudice against them.[1] As a result, joining this "sect" was regarded as tantamount to religious apostasy and generally meant being shunned and despised by fellow Germans as a fanatic or even a heretic. When German Baptist colporteurs and pastors engaged in evangelization, their meetings were often disrupted, and they were personally threatened, denounced, and physically abused.[2]

Furthermore, German Lutherans and Catholics natually maintained that they were Christians by virtue of their baptism and confirmation and therefore had no need of the conscious conversion and personal religious experience which were prerequisites to membership in a Baptist church.

---

[1]This was particularly the case with the Old Lutherans of the Missouri Synod. There was frequent crossfire between them and the German Baptists from the time the latter's paper first appeared till many years later.

[2]Home Mission Record, Jan. 1852, p. 19; ABPS An. Rep., 1854, pp. 37-8; ibid., 1855, p. 43; BHMM, Nov. 1891, pp. 303, 311.

Unchurched Germans who were alienated from the state church in Germany and had come to America as much for freedom from religion as for religious liberty, in turn, felt that the Baptist type of evangelical religion asked too much surrender and imposed too heavy discipline. And being accustomed to a more formal and sacramental view of Christianity, most of them felt that the Baptists generated too much emotion and neglected the sacramental means of grace.

In view of these obstacles and the further consideration that there was still only a handful of trained men to execute the mission, the fact that they managed to increase the membership of their churches more than six-fold in the twelve years from 1851 to 1863 becomes more commendable.

Most American Baptists were also pleased with these results. In spite of the general antagonism of the Germans to evangelical religion, optimists among the American Baptists maintained that the Germans were "by far the most hopeful class of our foreign population."[1] They were regarded as more "impressible" than some of the other immigrant groups and, despite their usual resistance to American religion, nevertheless more open to its influence than the Irish Catholics. Their "inquiring, searching, reflecting disposition" was thought to be highly favorable to religion, because, as a result, "they are at once more ready and better prepared to read and hear the gospel."[2]

---

[1] NYBUME An. Rep., 1852, p. 32. [2] Ibid.

For the most part, the ABHMS adopted the same attitude. Some nativists thought the society could have contributed more to the mission,[1] and those knowledgeable of its operations acknowledged that the efforts made for the spiritual welfare of the Germans was nothing like their numbers, influence, and importance demanded and that the number of missionaries among them should have been doubled or trebled.[2] On the other hand, its board alleged that it was "anxiously alive" to the importance of the mission,[3] but simply lacked the men and means to do more. In any event, there is no question but that the Home Mission Society considered the mission to have been "attended with success enough to warrant continued efforts, and to render them as much more efficient as possible."[4]

When the Rochester Theological Seminary encountered severe financial difficulties and its German Department was still in a very dependent state, it was proposed to relinquish that arm of the seminary's operation. But after a committee had thoroughly studied and weighed the issue--though undoubtedly strongly influenced by Rauschenbusch--its members, too, were "fully impressed with the conviction that the evidences of good results are so abundant from the labors of this department, that they deem it their duty to encourage and recommend its continuance."[5]

---

[1] Home Mission Record, July 1852, p. 41.

[2] Ibid., May 1853, p. 34; ibid., June 1853, p. 40.

[3] Ibid., Dec. 1852, p. 16.

[4] ABHMS An. Rep., 1853, p. 26.

[5] NYBUME An. Rep., 1860, p. 18. See also ibid., p. 10.

The American Baptist Publication Society was the one exception to this pattern. As late as 1854 it judged the Germans "to be one of the most open and accessible portions of the community to Baptist influence,"[1] and affirmed that the great success which had followed well-directed labor in their behalf supplied "abundant motives for increased diligence in the future."[2] As evidence of its sincerity, it increased the number of German colporteurs it employed to a total of about fifteen by 1856. But within five years it had terminated them all.

Part of the reason for its action was financial. Because of the recession which began in 1857, it reduced the total number of colporteurs it employed from 109 in 1856 to 42 in 1860. But the ratio of German colporteurs to the total dropped from one-third in 1850 to zero by 1860. So there were obviously more than financial considerations involved. German colporteurs were less profitable because their cliental was smaller, less approachable, and of fewer means. But more basically, the Society seems to have become increasingly dissatisfied with the growing autonomy of the German churches and to have concluded that it was unwise to spend more money on what it regarded as a temporary, short-term operation.[3]

In addition to general satisfaction over the results which had already been achieved, there was reason to expect even greater things to

---

[1] ABPS An. Rep., 1854, p. 5.

[2] Ibid., 1853, p. 23. See also DS, June 1854, p. 4.

[3] D S., Sept. 1875, p. 265.

XUM

come. Because of considerable pietistic influence upon the German churches,[1] they took an interest in missions from the time of their inception. As early as 1851, it was determined that one of the purposes for their projected denominational paper, Der Sendbote des Evangeliums,[2] was to report on the progress of foreign missions,[3] and by 1854 the pennyless German churches were beginning to make contributions to the American Baptist Missionary Union.[4] The small church August Rauschenbusch was serving at the time had a policy stipulating that its monthly collections would be designated alternately for foreign missions and local purposes, even though the pastor's salary was consequently very meager at times.[5] A broader and clearer demonstration of this missionary spirit was evidenced at the first session of the Western Conference in 1859. At a time when hardly any of the young churches of that conference could support their pastors alone, and some of them not at all, they organized a missionary society[6] and founded a missionary paper,[7] specifically "to rouse

---

[1]Eric H. Ohlmann, "A Historical Study of the Influence of Pietistic Thought on the North American Baptist General Conference During its Formative Years, 1839-1883" (unpublished Th.M. thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966).

[2]Which was begun the following year.

[3]Verh. (E), 1851, p. 7. [4]DS, March 1855, p. 4.

[5]Walter Rauschenbusch, Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch (Cassel, Germany: Kommissionsverlag von J. G. Oncken Nachfolger, 1901), p. 181.

[6]To finance and administer the visitation of qualified pastors among scattered groups of German Baptists and of pastorless churches. (Verh. (W), 1859, p. 4).

[7]Die Biene auf dem Missionsfeld.

and foster the missionary spirit in German churches."[1] Two years later the older Eastern Conference constituted itself into a mission society.[2] With such zeal and sacrifice, the prospects of further expansion looked promising.

Thus, by the end of this formative period, the basic operational procedure of the mission had been established, the numerical results were meeting with the approval of most agencies involved, and the active responses of those who had been won inspired hope for the future.

---

[1] Ibid., Jan. 1860, p. 1. See also Verh. (W), 1859, p. 5.

[2] Verh. (E), 1861, pp. 15-7.

CHAPTER 2

AMERICAN BAPTIST MOTIVES FOR THE MISSION: EVANGELIZATION

Why did American Baptists undertake this mission? Why were they concerned about German-Americans at a time when there were still countless unchurched Anglo-Americans in the country? The answers to these questions are more difficult to ascertain than the what, when, where, and how of the mission but are crucial to any comprehension of the subject. The underlying motives for the mission in themselves tell much of the story. Besides helping to account for the launching of the mission in the first place, they clarify the American Baptists' objectives for the mission and help to explain why German-Americans were singled out as the subjects, why certain operational procedures were adopted, why the American Baptist input fluctuated from time to time, and why the German Baptists responded as they did.

American Baptists have repeatedly claimed that the primary motive for their home mission work has always been evangelism, that is, to win people to faith in Jesus Christ.[1] In the centennial history of the ABHMS, for instance, Dr. Austin K. DeBlois maintained:

Evangelism and education have always been the outstanding phases of

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1914, p. 34; Missions, Feb. 1914, p. 123; Norman H. Maring, American Baptists--Whence and Whither (Valley Forge: The Judson Press, 1968), p. 56. For a fuller definition of evangelism see p. 1, fnt. 2.

> the work, always the two foci of our home missionary ellipse. . . . To bring human souls into the presence of their Redeemer, and to train souls for effective Christian living, have been the determinative working principles.[1]

Although all facets of their home mission enterprise included some educational elements, their major educational thrust consisted of schools among the Negroes of the South. Evangelism, therefore, has generally been regarded as the primary motive for the rest of their home missions, including the ministry to foreign-speaking people in the United States.[2]

To a certain extent this contention is true.[3] Because they adhered to the separation of church and state and to voluntary church membership, American Baptists have of necessity always been more or less evangelistic, and evangelism has been a prominent feature of their home mission enterprises.

Moreover, they were clearly becoming more evangelistic in the decades immediately preceding the inception of the German-American mission. From the time of their origin in the Great Awakening, the Separate Baptists had carried on intensive evangelistic activity in New England and some of the southern states, but the Regular Baptists were less aggressive in this regard.[4] During the eighteenth century the latter still

---

[1]White, op. cit., p. 9. The introduction is by Dr. DeBlois.

[2]Ibid., p. 121.

[3]The extent to which it is true will be examined in this chapter and the extent to which it needs modification or elaboration in the next.

[4]Newman, op. cit., p. 18.

harbored Calvinistic doubts about their right and ability to induce conversions and consequently proceeded with caution in this matter, fearing lest they transgress a divine prerogative. Through the growing number and influence of Separate Baptists, however, and particularly through their merging with the Regular Baptists,[1] a stronger evangelistic spirit was infused into the latter as well.[2] The new wave of revivalism in America during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, with their accompanying modifications of Calvinist theology,[3] and the general rise of the missionary spirit to which they gave rise[4] added further impetus to the new thrust.

Evidence of this mood can be seen in the denomination's organization for missionary purposes. Until 1800 the missionary program of both the Separate and Regular Baptists had been left to local churches and individual associations. Thereafter, local and state home mission societies were formed, and in 1814, despite widespread fear of a centralization of authority, The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States for Foreign Missions[5] was

---

[1]The union occurred around the turn of the century through a succession of mergers on the state level. Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists (rev. ed.; Valley Forge: The Judson Press, 1963), pp. 229-31.

[2]Ibid., p. 225.

[3]See e.g. William G. McLoughlin, The American Evangelicals, 1800-1900, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), pp. 4-5.

[4]Oliver W. Elsbree, The Rise of the Missionary Spirit in America, 1790-1815 (Williamsport, Pa: Williamsport Printing Co., 1928).

[5]Soon to become known as the Triennial Convention.

organized. To be sure, these developments resulted in part from the adoption of the societal approach to missionary activities in which the churches were already engaged, in the first case, and to a foreign mission work which was uninvitedly thrust upon them, in the second instance.[1] But they also reflect the denomination's growing awareness of its missionary responsibilities and less hesitation to engage in evangelism.[2] The state conventions organized after 1821 were also essentially home mission societies.

This increased sensitivity to the religious needs of others, acceptance of the missionary responsibilities involved, and willingness to respond more evangelistically were also major causes for the organization of the Baptist General Tract Society[3] in 1824 and the American Baptist Home Mission Society in 1832. The latter, for instance, was founded, according to the records, because "the spiritual destitution of many of the new states in the Union [had become] the subject of anxious consideration."[4] And at its first meeting the executive committee declared that the one "grand purpose" of the society was to be "the preaching of the gospel to every creature in our country."[5]

---

[1]That is, when Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice became Baptists while on their way to India, under commission from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and appealed to Baptists in America for support, since they could no longer expect backing from the Congregationalists.

[2]Edwin S. Gaustad, Historical Atlas of Religion in America (New York; Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962), p. 57.

[3]Later to be known as the American Baptist Publication Society.

[4]ABHMS An. Rep., 1832, p. 3. [5]Ibid., p. 6.

It is true, not all American Baptists had embraced evangelism. As the denomination began to organize and rally its forces for home and foreign missions, anti-mission churches and associations emerged among the ranks. Believing that missions and all other benevolent efforts were mere "money-getting" affairs, species of the church-and-state amalgamation, and "inconsistent with the purity and simplicity of the gospel; as human devices for accomplishing that work of God which he claims as his peculiar prerogative, and thus sacrilegiously attempting to take his work out of his hands,"[1] these churches refused to cooperate in organized forms of missions and not infrequently denied fellowship to those who did. But even this group was more opposed to missionary societies than to evangelism itself. Moreover, at the time of their greatest strength they were only a minority in the denomination, and by mid-century their forces and influence were waning.[2]

In fact, at about the same time that they were embarking upon the German-American mission, American Baptists became even more aggressively evangelistic. This seems to have been largely due to a growing other-worldliness, and therefore a changing perspective on the purpose of evangelism. During the 1830's and early 1840's they spoke of evangelism more as a means of safeguarding and ameliorating the moral condition of the country[3] than as a urgent plea for people to make their election

---

[1] Ibid., 1833, p. 18.

[2] Ibid., 1848, p. 21; ibid., 1852, p. 28; William W. Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier, Vol. I: The Baptists, 1783-1850 (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1931), pp. 62-76.

[3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1832, p. 6; ibid., 1844, pp. 13-4; et al.

sure. The latter is seldom mentioned in their home mission literature. But then, in the 1840's the emphasis shifted from evangelism as a means of producing moral character and promoting social morality to that of saving immortal souls, "hastening to the judgment of the great day and the retribution of eternity."[1] The more evangelistic Baptists in the South and West had always stressed the latter. But among those in the mid-Atlantic states, who dominated the societies engaged in home missions, the shift did not occur until the 1840's. Perhaps it was due to the waning of Enlightenment religion, the growing influence of Pietism, the emphasis on the eternal destiny of souls in the simplified gospel of the revivalists (who were gaining influence in the East), the increased concern for the heathen and the salvation of the world, and the widespread imminent apocalytic expectations of the millennium during the 1830's and 1840's. In any case, the spirit of love for "the salvation of immortal souls from the degradation of a total apostacy, and from the bitter pains of eteranl death" began to replace the moral improvement of society "as the great first principle which underlies all proper effort and all desirable prosperity in the system of modern missions."[2] Interest in man's soul began to take precedence over concern for his present life. Many members of the ABHMS came to regard the salvation of lost souls as the first great aim of the Society.[3] "Not that we despise other things;" one of them explained, "they may be good in themselves, but they are as nothing when compared with the salvation of the

---

[1] Ibid., 1849, p. 16. [2] Ibid., 1856, pp. 49-52.

[3] Home Mission Record, Dec. 1857, p. 47.

soul."[1] As is usually the case where this view prevails, the task of evangelism assumed much more urgency.[2]

It is not surprising, therefore, that this heightened concern for the eternal salvation of the lost was accompanied by broader approval and even cultivation of revivalistic methods.[3] Separate Baptists, who were a product of revivalism, had always employed such methods. Regular Baptists, on the other had, had tended to regard them as an unwarranted intrusion on the regular means of grace. Through their union with the Separate Baptists, they began to absorb some of the latter's aggressive spirit. On account of the further exigencies of the frontier, the effectiveness of the revivalistic techniques in recruiting new members, and the growing nationalism during the early decades of the nineteenth century, they, too, began to make use of revivalistic methods in their local churches and association meetings (though camp meetings continued generally to meet with disfavor).[4]

While they accepted revivalism as a legitimate means of evangelization, however, they did not actively promote it. The ABHMS, for instance, did not specifically discourage the revivalistic activities of some of its missionaries during the 1830's and 1840's, but it did little or

---

[1] Ibid., Jan. 1851, p. 17.

[2] R. Pierce Beaver, "Missionary Motivation through Three Centuries," in Reinterpretation in American Church History, ed. by Jerald C. Brauer (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), pp. 125-9.

[3] Primarily protracted meetings and, after about 1830, some of the other "new measures" then coming into wide use.

[4] Torbet, op. cit., pp. 301-2.

nothing to foster them either. Then in the late 1840's and early 1850's it showed a definite change of mind. It began to report revivals on the field with an obvious sense of satisfaction[1] and urged prayer for more of the same.[2] By 1851 the Board of the society itself made a special point to record,

> with lively gratitude to the Father of mercies, the outpouring of the Spirit on many of our stations and the conversion of many souls. . . . These manifestations of Divine grace are the hope of our churches and our land. Their occurrence should excite our warmest gratitude to God, and our liveliest expectation of the ultimate triumph of the gospel over all tradition, and superstition, and error of men.[3]

Not only did the society begin to promote revivals, therefore, but soon came to regard them as "the hope of the land."[4]

This growing acceptance of revivalistic techniques was not due only to the American Baptists' changing emphasis in evangelism, even though the two developments occurred concurrently. As Timothy L. Smith has demonstrated, the popularity of revival methods surged forward in major segments of all denominations between 1840 and 1857 and shifted from rural and frontier areas to eastern urban centers.[5] Because of the effectiveness of revivalism in recruiting new members for voluntary churches on the frontier, urbanites were increasingly tempted to employ the same method

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1847, p. 12; ibid., 1848, p. 12. The Home Mission Record even started a separate section for the purpose in 1850.

[2] Home Mission Record, Dec. 1849, p. 14.

[3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1851, p. 27.

[4] Home Mission Record, Jan. 1851, p. 18.

[5] Timothy L. Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), chapter 3.

but were generally repulsed by the frontier fanaticism associated with it and by their own Calvinistic reservations. When, however, an increasing number of educated evangelists purged revivalism of some of its uncouth accretions and grounded it in liberalized Calvinism, it was rendered palatable to the educated clergymen and the urbanites of the East, and in fact came to dominate their religious life.[1]

The eminent Baptist evangelists, Jacob Knapp, Jabez Swan, Emerson Andrews, and Ransom Dunn played this role in their denomination, achieving the final triumph of revivalism in its New England and mid-Atlantic churches. With the added support of some influential college presidents, Andrew Fuller's theological works,[2] and the Watchman and Reflector,[3] the cause advanced, culminating in nearly unanimous acceptance and support of the Awakening of 1858 by American Baptists.[4] Thus, the Home Mission Record was probably speaking for most of the predominantly eastern leadership of the American Baptist mission societies, when, in 1857, it stated:

> The work of Home Missions can not prosper without revivals, more than grass or corn can not flourish without rain. As plants die in a drought, so churches and all evangelical organizations wither and become unfruitful without revivals of pure and undefiled religion. . . . Every revival is a fresh manifestion of God's presence in the world, a new communication of his love and power to his people, a fresh deposit of those elements of strength

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Andrew Fuller was a eighteenth century British Baptist who, probably more than any one else in this time, modified Calvinism and promoted evangelism among Particular Baptists in England. His complete works were published in America in 1799.

[3] An influential denominational paper published in Boston.

[4] Smith, op. cit., pp. 48-9, 69.

> and goodness by which they are to overcome and subdue the world to Christ. . . .[1]

Revivalism had become vogue.

The most obvious evidence of this trend toward more aggressive evangelism and revivalism is the denomination's phenomenal growth between the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. In 1784 there were only 470 Baptist churches in the United States, with a membership of 35,101.[2] By 1860 their number had increased more than twenty-eight fold, amounting to about one million members.[3]

Although Anglo-Americans were the primary objects of the intensified American Baptist home mission outreach, the denomination's evangelistic concern also extended to new Americans. In the four decades from 1820 to 1860 nearly five million of them streamed into the United States, so that by the end of that period aliens and those of foreign extraction amounted to one fifth of the total population.[4] Because they tended to gravitate to the Mississippi Valley, the percentage there was even higher. No missionary-minded denomination could ignore such numbers.

Germans were by far the largest single nationality represented by the newcomers, accounting for almost one quarter of the number. Of these

---

[1] Home Mission Record, Dec. 1857, p. 45. See also ibid., April 1858, p. 13.

[2] Lemuel C. Barnes, Mary C. Barnes, and Edward M. Stephenson, Pioneers of Light: The First Century of the American Baptist Publication Society, 1824-1924 (Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, n.n.), p. 435.

[3] Gaustad, op. cit., p. 58.

[4] Grose, op. cit., p. 26.

it was generally estimated that one third were Lutherans, one third Roman Catholics, and the remaining third unaffiliated with any church and many of them openly hostile to any form of Christianity. In the opinion of the Baptists, therefore, most of them needed to be reached with the "true" gospel.

Among the unchurched were not only those who had abandoned the church but also large numbers who were aggressively opposed to any form of organized religion and apostates or infidels who rejected revealed religion itself.[1] In the judgment of the American Baptists, these people had not yet "experienced" true religion.

Catholic Germans were not ranked much higher than the infidels. As most nativists during those years,[2] American Baptists even questioned whether Catholicism was Christian. They held that

> popery fetters the mind, and enslaves the soul. It has never sought the education of the entire community; it has denied the common use of the holy scriptures, and the right of private judgment in matters of faith; it teaches for doctrines the commandments of men, substitutes implicit faith, and the penance of its devotees for the merits of Christ as the foundation of human hope, arrogates the power of absolving men from their sins, and dissevers morality from piety; so that a man may be a good Catholic, and certain of salvation, while at the same time he is a bad man.

The writer then concluded, "Such briefly is popery, and whether this be Christianity, may be referred to those who have studied the New Testament, and form their notions of religion from that volume."[3] How they would answer the question was thought to be a foregone conclusion and was

---

[1]See pp. 66-70 for more detail. [2]Billington, op. cit., pp. 351ff.

[3]ABHMS An Rep., 1835, p. 27.

regarded as sufficient reason for greater vigilance and ardor in the cause of evangelism.

Even most German Lutherans were thought to be devoid of the true gospel. In part they suffered from the stigma of their radical countrymen in America. Americans frequently labelled all Germans as irreligious, because that segment which fit the description was most vocal, and its strength was blown far out of proportion by those who were alarmed by it. Nevertheless, much of German Lutheranism in America at the time was sufficiently formalistic and infused by rationalism that even pietistic Germans vehemently denounced it. American Baptists, consequently, were easily persuaded by men like their own esteemed John Mason Peck, who after many years of close contact with Germans on the frontier, remarked, "All the Lutheranism of German immigrants which I have seen is semi-infidel and irreligious. By this, I mean an entire disregard of all duties and obligation properly religious."[1] From the American Baptist perspective, therefore, practically all the German immigrants needed to be evangelized.

After all, German-Americans had immortal souls, too. Insofar as the American Baptists were genuinely concerned about the eternal welfare of souls, therefore, the "spiritual destitution" of the German population demanded that something also be done for their spiritual well-being.[2] Because, American Baptists believed that "a lamentable indifference on the subject of religion" largely prevailed among the Germans, generally;[3]

---

[1] Ibid., 1849, p. 52. [2] Ibid., 1853, p. 25; DS, Jan. 1854, p. 4.
[3] NYBUME An. Rep., 1854, pp. 28-9.

XUM

that infidelity was widely current among the educated; that Roman Catholic "superstitions" enslaved many others; and that the rest came out of the old state churches, "where the vital truths of the gospel, regeneration by the Spirit, justification by faith in Christ, have never been taught,"[1] then the spiritual welfare of these people clearly demanded "that the truth, as it is in Jesus, should be made known to them."[2] And revivalism provided an effective method by which to do so.

Evangelism, therefore, was clearly a significant motivation for American Baptist home missions during this period, including their mission to German-Americans. In the latter case, however, American Baptists were not only concerned to secure the eternal salvation of individual souls. They also had a further purpose in mind, which may even have been the dominant reason for pursuing the mission.

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1865, p. 39. [2] Ibid., 1864, p. 44.

CHAPTER 3

AMERICAN BAPTIST MOTIVES FOR THE MISSION: AMERICANIZATION

Although the salvation of souls undoubtedly became the primary motive for American Baptist home missions to Anglo-Americans, it would be a serious mistake simply to assume, as has generally been done, that the same was also true of their home missions to the immigrants. As has already been indicated, plucking brands from the fire was also a factor in the second case, but American Baptists were aiming at a further objective as well. Fearing the effects of foreign influences upon the country and believing that the gospel provided the surest safeguard against this threat, they purposed to evangelize the immigrants in order to safeguard American life and institutions as well as for soteriological reasons. In fact, there is reason to believe that this nationalistic or nativistic consideration may even have been the stronger element in their motivation.

Because Baptists have always championed the causes of religious liberty and the separation of church and state, it is sometimes falsely assumed that "they had committed themselves to a policy of noninterference in civil affairs which precluded preoccupation with what many regarded as a nonreligious issue."[1] A belief in the separation of church and state

---

[1]Torbet, op. cit., p. 282. See also Henry F. May, Protestant Churches and Industrial America, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1949), p. 190.

need not lead to that conclusion and was not viewed in those terms by most American Protestants during the nineteenth century. Nor did Baptists go to that extreme. Even though they were insistent upon the autonomy of the church and state in their respective realms, they recognized that the Church is not only responsible for the spiritual welfare of its members but also has certain obligations to the rest of the social order.

As most of their contemporaries[1] they affirmed that religion is indispensable to the welfare of a nation. Sound government, they reasoned, rests on good morals, and good morals are the product of true religion. And as all American Christians, they held more specifically, that Christianity is the only sound basis for good morals and therefore the best hope for America.

This nation, they held, was built upon a Christian foundation and was constantly being influenced by Christian principles. One of their prominent home missionaries, Rev. T. R. Cressy, explained this view in emphatic terms:

> But what is the BASIS of our government? Unlike any other upon earth--it is the Bible. Our Republic in its constitution and laws is of heavenly origin. When our fathers of '76, in the formation of the Constitution of these United States, borrowed a ray from Greece and Rome, they borrowed stars and suns from the Bible. It was God that gave these elementary principles to our forefathers,

---

[1]E.g., Charles I. Foster, An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960), p. 26; Sidney E. Mead, "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America: 1607-1850" in The Ministry in Historical Perspectives, ed. by H. R. Niebuhr and D. D. Williams (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1956), pp. 225-6.

> as the pillar of fire by night and the cloud by day, for their guidance. From the Bible our Constitution borrowed its elements, and its proportions, and its power. It is truly testified by Hume, that the Puritans introduced the elementary principles of republican liberty into the English Constitution; and when they came to form Colonial constitutions and laws, they copied with implicit confidence the constitution and laws of Moses. Here, these elementary principles, borrowed by the Puritans from the Bible, were made by our patriot fathers of '76, the foundation of the immortal instrument, the Constitution of these United States.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The Bible is our nursery house book and common school book; our primary text book, our code of civil jurisprudence; our ultimate appeal--the crucible for refining American mind; yea, the divine mould into which it is cast.[1]

Some of Cressy's colleagues may not have stated the case as crassly, but they all agreed with him in principle.

To safeguard and to perpetuate this cherished heritage, moreover, they insisted that the country must continue to be shaped by the same source.[2] For "it is the power of the gospel on men's hearts and consciences . . . that produces those results which constitute the elements of any nation's true prosperity."[3] So to achieve "the high national character hoped for, and the excellence of national influence aimed at," the gospel's

> hallowed influence must be cast around all our civil institutions; it must give character to our literature; guide our science; interweave itself with the arts, and like a broad, strong band it must encompass and bind together in one compact body all elements of social life.[4]

In a republic, maintaining a healthy social order according to

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1851, pp. 71-2.

[2] Ibid., 1849, p. 19; ibid., 1845, pp. 15-6.

[3] Ibid., 1847, p. 18. See also ibid., 1844, pp. 13-4.

[4] Ibid., pp. 14-5.

this formula requires evangelizing the entire body politic. American Baptists realized this and accepted the task. The executive committee of their home mission society assumed:

> All must see that without general intelligence, and sound morality, the republic cannot be safe; and all ought to consider that the weekly administration of the gospel tends greatly to promote such intelligence, and that religious principle is the only substantial basis of such morality.[1]

Accordingly, the society passed a formal resolution, stating that "the civil and political benefits to be derived from religion, constitute a strong incentive to effort, to spread its influence through our country."[2] And again in 1847 the board reported:

> The importance of our trust cannot be appreciated. The promotion of the social and moral interests of our country; the perpetuity of its civil and religious liberty; the diffusion and prevalence of christian influences in moulding the national character, and strengthening its bonds of union; we are bound to make subject of our earnest solicitude.[3]

It even came to think of its missionaries, in a sense, as spiritual agents of the government.[4]

Nor did their growing otherworldiness toward the end of this period significantly change the American Baptists' sense of obligation to the state. Perhaps sensing the danger of such a development, Rev. D. Shepardson cautioned the ABHMS: "Let us not aim merely at great schemes for future ages, but at the immediate salvation of our fellow-citizens. Our greatest duty is our nearest."[5] Addressing the same society one year

---

[1] Ibid., 1837, p. 27. See also Home Mission Record, March 1854, p. 21.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1837, p. 11. [3] Ibid., 1847, p. 17. [4] Ibid., p. 205.

[5] Home Mission Record, March 1854, p.21.

later, Rev. Harvey Miller, acknowledged that it was understood and accepted by all that the principal aim of the Home Mission Society was the evangelization of American but added, "This Society does not practically ignore any real interest of man, considered individually or socially, with regard to his physical, intellectual or moral necessities. The founders and patrons of this Society" were fully aware, "from history and observation, that the influence of the Gospel is absolutely essential to the highest development of man, in his social and civil relations, in his intellectual and moral nature. . . ."

> Sir, we do know that man is not shorn of his manhood by subjection to 'the powers of the world to come.' He is in no sense debased by communion with the God of Glory, and by moral conformity to the image of his Son. He cannot be unfitted for his relations and duties to human society because he is 'made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.' . . . No, sir; while the Gospel grasps the highest interests of the life to come, it does not disdain, but rather fosters the subordinate interests of the life that now is. And vast and varied are those incidental benefits which Religion,--as Hall would say,--thus scatters by the way, in her march to immortality.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Hence, Sir, this Society, as a Home Mission, appeals to our local attachment, and love of country. It prosecutes its beneficent action in the land of our birth, the home of our fathers. . . . Indeed, to disregard the interests of his Home Field would involve much of the unmitigated baseness of neglecting to provide for one's family.[1]

Although Rev. Miller was primarily addressing himself to another issue, his reasoning is applicable here, because the task of building a sound morality was included among the "interests of the Home Field" which claimed the Society's regard.

Their own principles, moreover, precluded relegating the

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1855, pp. 84-7. See also Home Mission Record, April 1858, p. 13.

responsibility to any other agency. Because of their pessimistic view of man, they were convinced that "moral restraint may be thrown around an unregenerate mind, which may produce temporary benefit;--but, with the first incentive congenial with that mind, the restraint is broken, and the corruptions of unregenerate human nature prevail."[1] Nor could education alone be trusted to properly mold the popular will. In the words of Rev. J. B. Olcott:

> Education is important, and so long as it is under the control of religious prinicple it is safe. But as man is, the more you educate him, the more powerful he is to do evil. In France it has been shown by actual statistics, that crime increased in proportion as men were educated, that is educated without religious principle. What has an educated intellect done in Germany? It has well nigh destroyed the Sabbath, broken down the family altar, and covered the land with a social infidelity.[2]

Only the gospel and the power of the Holy Spirit can produce good morals, the indispensable material for "developing a perfect civilization on earth."[3] For not only do they regenerate the heart, the wellspring of good morals, but also provide moral guidance or direction for the Christian citizen.

> If Christianity has precepts for the heart, so has it precepts for the regulation of the life in all its manifold developments. If it gives us rules for church organization and church government, equally does it furnish principles which should characterize the formation and administration of civil government. If it tells us how we ought to behave ourselves in the house of God, equally does it instruct us how to conduct ourselves in society, in the business mart, and in every other place or capacity in which we are called to act. It furnishes certain fundamental principles which should guide us in education, architecture, furniture, dress, diet, etc., etc.[4]

---

[1] Home Mission Record, Dec. 1849, p. 13.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1863, pp. 40-1.

[3] Home Mission Record, April 1858, p. 13. [4] Ibid., p. 14.

Given this line of reasoning, it was clearly the churches' imperative and patriotic duty to permeate society and control it, in order to render national existence safe.

Therefore, while American Baptists came to emphasize the eternal welfare of souls as a motive for the task of evangelization, they were still very much aware of their obligation to the present social order and in fact were more duteous about certain aspects of that obligation than they had been before. Several considerations kept them alerted to their responsibility and compelled them to action.

Among other things, they realized that they were living in an age of investigation, of ideological conflict, and of serious social unrest. In addition to the slavery issue, they listed

> the continual expansion of our population; the deficiency of means, in important sections of our country, for the education of youth; the propaganda of religious errors, delusions and fanaticism; the arrogant assumptions of prelacy; the assaults upon our cherished system of common school education and our more cherished version of God's word by foreign ecclesiastics; and the unceasing augmentation of that same class of men in the country.[1]

At the same time they affirmed, "Our safeguard in all these associations, is the free dissemination of the gospel. By that men are best taught their rights, and how to enjoy them. Its maxims are the only sure guide to human liberty and happiness. . . ."[2] The responsibility of giving "a right direction to inquiry," therefore, rested squarely upon their shoulders; they could not escape it nor the heavy sense of duty it evoked.

During this period, they were particularly concerned to exercise

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1844, pp. 13-4. [2] Ibid., p. 14.

that kind of leadership and moral influence on the region west of the Appalachians. As early as the 1820's Baptists in the East were becoming anxious about religious and moral conditions on the frontier and in 1831 arranged for one of their number to make a tour of investigation.[1] It was as a result of that tour that the ABHMS was organized and instructed to give chief attention to the "Valley of the West."[2]

Only a few years later perceptive observers among them noted that, at the rate the Mississippi Valley was developing numerically and economically, a majority of the American people would be found west of the Appalachians in twenty years and

> the character of its population for intelligence, morality, and religion, will determine the national character, and the fate of the American Republic. [And] the influence of this country will materially affect, for evil or for good, the moral condition of the world.[3]

They further noted that "the character of the mighty West is not yet formed; the moral elements which are to compose it exist in a plastic form, and they are in a state of rapid combination."[4] And they realized the crucial importance and urgency of molding those "elementary materials" aright while they were still plastic.

> This, then, is the critical period in the history of the Valley, when every effort is felt, and every blow will tell; any impression may easily be made, and every impression made will be likely to be permanent. A most momentous experiment is making; many and widely different influences are at work, and every philosopher and statesman, but especially every philanthropist, and patriot, and Christian, should feel a deep interest in the process, and for the issue.[5]

---

[1] The Baptist Home Mission Monthly, Feb. 1882, p. 43.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1832, p. 3. See also ibid., pp. 7, 13.

[3] Ibid., 1835, pp. 20-1. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid., 1847, p. 47.

Speaking more precisely of the role of the Baptists in this process, the missionary committee of the Vermont Baptist Convention reported to the ABHMS:

> Your Committee would distinctly and earnestly avow the belief that as Baptists, a heavy responsibility rests upon us to participate largely in laying the foundations of social order--in disseminating the germs of liberty, civil and religious--in diffusing the savory influence of a simple, earnest and scriptural piety--among the masses that inhabit and shall yet inhabit the most fertile portions of our country.[1]

What added even greater urgency to the task was the growing conviction that God had planned a magnanimous destiny for America. Since the Mississippi Valley was the major target of American Baptist home mission endeavors at the time, even a regional version of the larger dream caused considerable sensation. For judging from its alarming population growth and economic development, many were convinced that the Valley "must inevitably exert over the political and religious destiny of our race, an influence controlling and immeasurably extensive."[2] A committee appointed to report on missions in the valley even postulated that

> Divine Providence seems to have pointed out this middle section of our common country, as a field whereon the great contest, at this period of the world's history between truth and error, holiness and sin, should be waged, and the victory won. Here are congregating adherents of all the diversified forms of a corrupt and spurious Christianity and of the infidel liberalism of modern Europe, together with the vicious and reckless of every class.[3]

For them, this prospect was "a potent argument for strenuous, protracted, and systematic efforts to pre-occupy the ground."[4]

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Home Mission Record, Nov. 1856, p. 41.

[3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1853, p. 59; Home Mission Record, Jan. 1854, p. 13.

[4] Home Mission Record, Nov. 1856, p. 41.

XUM

With the discovery of gold in California and the conception of a transcontinental railway, the vision was greatly expanded and the motivation intensified. Besides the vast agricultural and mineral resources which the Far West was believed to contain, it offered particularly exciting commercial prospects. In soliciting aid for their work, missionaries from the region soon utilized this argument, predicting:

> The Vast Pacific, with its numerous and populous islands, and China, and the surrounding countries lying beyond, will stimulate an active, varied and rich ocean commerce. The iron track will ere long bind together and unite the Atlantic and Pacific borders. The Pacific coast will thus find itself placed on the great highway of nations; and an internal commerce, such as the world has never seen, cannot fail to be the result.[1]

Perhaps it would also become, "a point for the world-wide diffusion of loftier principles and sublimer truths than those which belong to civil polity; the principles of the gospel, the truths of SALVATION!"[2]

American Baptists, however, also observed that the spiritual welfare of the frontiersmen in all of the younger states and territories was in great danger until they were able to provide and support at least the basic social and religious institutions.[3] Not that "moral and religious evils exist in that quarter which are unknown to ourselves," the eastern dominated board of the ABHMS was cautious to add, but that

> they exist there in far greater proportion to the counteracting influences of true religion and pure morality, than in the Eastern States; while the force of existing religious example, as a restraint upon sin, or a corrective of bewildering desire for rapid accumulation of wealth, if operative at all, is often reduced to the smallest degree.[4]

If these regions were to achieve their divinely ordained destinies,

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1852, p. 63. [2] Ibid., 1854, p. 67.

[3] Ibid., 1856, p. 28. [4] Ibid., 1859, p. 27.

therefore, it was imperative, American Baptists believed, "to throw in the grand vitalizing element of the gospel, in its purity, and in forms, and on a scale adequate to give it power--permanent, growing, expanding power," to baptize these areas in their infancy "in the great laver of evangelical truth, and array [them] in the shining robes of evangelical institutions."[1]

The stakes were high. Not only the future of the West--from the Appalachians to the Pacific-- but that of the nation and the entire world was believed to be in the balance. For the often repeated observation that America was "discovered in the morning sun of the Reformation" and was settled by the "spiritual elite of the world"; that a divine hand had restored "this country from the control of the Papal church, that it might be intrusted under God to the guardianship of a great, free and Protestant nation"; and many other features about its physical character and commercial conditions suggested to many American Baptists that God had vast and momentous designs for the entire nation.[2] Perhaps it was, they conjectured, that "God has raised up this nation to become a beacon-light to the nations of the earth,--under His guidance and spirit to become a model of all governments and to give moral and political lessons to the world."[3] Combined with the apocalytic furor of the 1840's and 1850's, it even came to be widely believed that

> the moral conflict of the world is to be fought here--between truth error, the Bible and tradition, right and wrong, liberty and intolerance, freedom and slavery, in short between all that is worth

---

[1] Ibid., 1852, p. 64. [2] Ibid., 1851, pp. 68-71.

[3] Home Mission Record, Dec. 1849, p. 13.

> living for, and all that is dreadful to live among--a conflict that really involves all old moral questions and religious controversies agitated in other times, and all the issues now pending, and to which all nations are sending their representatives, to help us or to hinder us in settling this conflict, . . .[1]

Such great issues would be wrought out for God's glory in America as in no other place on earth, except Palestine.[2]

These were reasons enough for the strenuous promotion of home missions. "But a more powerful argument still in their favor," according to Rev. T. R. Cressy, "is the influence that America is to exert upon the world's conversion. Here is our main point--our argument cumulative. God has not thus strangely brought America to her present position merely for her own benefit."[3] As early as 1835 the ABHMS observed that

> there are indications of Divine Providence; that the chief burthen [sic], as to men and measures, in that great achievement of the church, the conversion of the world to Christianity, is to be sustained by two nations, Great Britain, and the United States of America.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., July 1857, p. 25. For, as an anonymous writer explained: "It is evident that a contest for the mastery of the world, between the powers of light and the powers of darkness, is imminent and inevitable. The nations in which the Bible is freely circulated, and the Gospel publicly preached, are ranging themselves on the one side; and the nations from which the Bible is prohibited, and where the preaching of Christ crucified is forbidden, are ranging themselves on the other. Within the lifetime of men who now hear me, the question will probably be decided, whether the kingdom of Christ is now to proceed to universal victory, or ages of intellectual and moral darkness are again to overspread the earth. It is for such a crisis as this that the disciples of Christ are now called upon to prepare.

"But more than this. It is obvious that this question is really to be decided in our own country. So long as the light of true Christianity shines brightly here, the rest of the world cannot be enveloped in darkness" (Ibid., Dec. 1858, p. 45).

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1851, p. 68. [3] Ibid., p. 73.

[4] Ibid., 1835, p. 7.

Thereafter the conviction steadily grew.[1] The mounting sentiment about the destiny of America and that of the Anglo-Saxon race and the conquest of America's isolation by means of the railroad and telegram nurtured the idea. But it was not until the California Gold Rush and the projection of a transcontinental railway that the entire picture became clear: "The Capes would nearly cease to be doubled: Asia would reach Europe and Europe Asia through the heart of America--America would become the thoroughfare--the depot of the world."[2] All the necessary facilities for the conversion of the world had been supplied by providence. The implication was clear: God had destined America to play the leading role in the conversion of the world. As Rev. D. Shepardson assessed the situation:

> Never before were the destinies of all nations so centered, in the Providence of God, upon one spot and one age. Never before, neither to prophets nor to apostles; neither to the champions of the Reformation nor to the pioneers of modern missions, were such facilities for wielding all the elements of moral power committed as God hath committed to us. . . . Here we are, a nation free, young, and vigorous; the brightest, fairest, loveliest portion of God's moral vineyard, with but a few dark spots upon our escutcheon, retired from the old world, and its terrible convulsions, as though God designed us to be for the healing of the nations, and had hence given us this land of revivals, this quiet retreat, this bower of prayer, this sanctuary, that we may first teach ourselves, and then go and teach all nations. So please Almighty God, we will arise, impelled by the purest and strongest motives--we will arise and so toil for Zion, that we may preserve, improve and transmit the blessings of our inheritance, and thus leave the churches of Jesus pure and free when we enter upon our eternal reward.[3]

The conviction was even further enhanced for Rev. J. M. Sturtevant,

---

[1] Ibid., 1836, p. 15; ibid., 1846, p. 43; ibid., 1849, p. 77.

[2] Ibid., 1851, p. 75.

[3] Home Mission Record, March 1854, p. 22.

President of Illinois College, when he considered that "our own dear mother England (she ought to be called the mother of nations), is spreading abroad her own colonial settlements, largely composed of material kindred to our own, in almost every quarter of the globe."

> It is true, then beyond controversy or doubt, that the migrations of the English language, the spread of the old English stock, by peaceful colonization, over the unpeopled world, is the greatest phenomenon now visible on earth: it is the mightiest visible agency, which God is now employing, to change the religious and social condition of the human race, and plant the christian religion over the world, to make England and America thoroughly christian is to fill the world with the knowledge of the Lord. It is to plant the gospel of Jesus Christ in every land, before the year of our Lord 2000.[1]

These were powerful incentives. Never before in the history of this country (or perhaps ever) had the missionary spirit reached such heights or inspired such a stupendous undertaking.

American Baptist motives for home missions, therefore, involved much more than rescuing the perishing. Their ultimate aim was to mold the entire social order according to Christian principles. It is interesting to note in this connection that they frequently spoke of their duties as patriots, philanthropists, and Christians--in that order.

Accordingly, they were determined to contravene anything which threatened America's social order and endangered its divinely ordained destiny. For several reasons immigrants came to be seen as precisely that kind of threat. Most of them had little or no knowledge of or experience with free institutions. Even worse, a large segment of them was suspected of deliberate subversion in an effort to bring the country

---

[1] Ibid., Jan. 1858, p. 1.

under foreign control.[1]

By the end of this period the sheer numbers of new arrivals posed some frightening prospectives. In the two decades from 1840 to 1860 alone, 4,311,465 came to the United States, 5.6 times as many as during the entire half century from 1790 to 1840.[2] In 1854 alone no less then 427,833 arrived. That was the record number for any one year during this period, but, just the same, from 1844 to 1862 the annual average was 231,701. As a consequence, the number of foreign-born in the United States increased 84.4 per cent from 1850 to 1860, the greatest increase of any decade in the country's history.[3]

Almost one-third of those who arrived between 1840 and 1860 were Germans,[4] so that by the end of that period they constituted over thirty-one per cent of the entire foreign-born population in the United States.[5] On account of the agricultural revolution in Germany, coupled with crop failures in the 1840's and 1850's; the ruin of local hand industries in competition with the new factory system; the suppression of political liberalism by Metternich machinations and the absolute-monarchial spirit of Prussia; the ill-fated revolution of 1848; the ecclesiastical

---

[1]ABHMS An. Rep., 1835, p. 12; ibid., 1845, p. 15; ibid., 1846, p. 17.

[2]Calculated from Wittke, op. cit., p. xvi. [3]Ibid., p. xv.

[4]Calculated from Albert B. Faust, The German Element in the United States: With Special Reference to its Political, Moral, Social, and Educational Influence (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909), I, 582 and Wittke, op. cit., p. xvi.

[5]Wittke, op. cit., p. 187.

paternalism of the civil authorities and the formalistic orthodoxy of the conservative state church; combined with the lure of prosperity and expansion, the triumph of Jacksonian democracy, and religious liberty in America; German immigration climbed from 15,291 in 1841 to a total of 215,009 in 1854, a peak exceeded only once by the slightly higher crest of 1882.

Although the immigrants generally avoided the outer frontier,[1] the majority of those who arrived during this period settled west of the Appalachians.[2] American Baptists particularly noted (as early as 1852):

> In the West, with its measureless resources of hidden fertility and wealth, the Germans hold decided preponderance, and manifest all those qualities of industry, thrift, independent thinking, intelligence and clannishness for which, everywhere, they are noted. We of the East have never begun to estimate the amount of influence in moulding our national character and destiny, which this people of a strange language are appointed to wield. They are numbered already by millions. In some of our Western cities and States they not merely hold what is sometimes called "the balance of power," but they reach, or approximate, a majority of the whole population. . . .[3]

Accordingly, a high percentage of the population in the Mississippi Valley, and to a lesser extent on the Pacific coast, whose development the American Baptists were so anxious to shape, were immigrants. If the American Baptist expectations for these regions were to be realized, therefore, they knew and affirmed:

> While the elements of society are there gathering from all parts of the world and its foundations are being laid in the new towns and settlements, that society will receive its type, form, and character, and take its position of mighty influence for weal or woe upon all future generations. How important that the gospel of Christ should exert a molding, guiding, controlling influence upon those mingling

---

[1] Hansen, op. cit., pp. 66-67. [2] Billington, op. cit., pp. 240-1.

[3] Home Mission Record, Aug. 1852, p. 46.

> elements! Never will it be the privilege of any other generation of Christians to lay the foundations and to exert the right influences in the very origin of new towns and settlements, as it will be of those who shall live and labor there for the next twenty-five years.[1]

The purpose was both to bring them "beneath the soul-sanctifying and saving influences of the gospel" and to teach them "the nature and proper use of true civil and religious freedom."[2]

The need to mold the immigrants aright seemed particularly urgent because an increasing number of American Baptists, reflecting the intense nativism of the early 1840's and 1850's, came to view them as a growing threat to America's civil and religious values and institutions, as forming "heathenism in the midst of Christianity; a despotism in the midst of a democracy; a dark mass, floating in golden sunlight; a crown of thorns hanging on the brow of Mercy."[3] Many in the denomination[4] were probably prepared to concur with the writer who emphatically asserted that, while human depravity is natural, it was "more fully developed" among the "foreign population," because in them it "is almost entirely unchecked; it is restrained by no healthful education or proper religious training."[5]

Since they believed that a country's national character rests

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1865, pp. 38-9. [2] Ibid., 1854, p. 35.

[3] Ibid., 1855, pp. 74-5. See also ibid., 1846, p. 17.

[4] There is no way of determining their exact number. The extent of coverage given to nativistic concerns in their periodicals, the intensity of that concern, and the almost unanimous agreement of the views expressed, however, suggest that they were shared by the majority in the denomination.

[5] Home Mission Record, Dec. 1855, p. 45.

XUM

upon a religious and moral basis, American Baptists were most concerned about the foreign influence on these dimensions of their country's life. And, from their perspective, there seemed to be good reason for alarm and fear. For both the religion and social customs of the immigrants appeared as "direct antagonisms of the ancient religion and morals of our people," and by mid-century they were "no longer proclaimed in the whispers of conscious intrusion, but in the loud notes of bold assault."[1] Both as Baptists and American evangelicals,[2] American Baptists viewed the religion of the European state churches, brought to this country by many immigrants, as wholly inadequate. Roman Catholicism, particularly during this period of intense anti-Catholicism throughout the country, seemed exceedingly ominous. And even worse--if that was possible--was the growing irreligion and bold infidelity of still other new Americans.

Since their number included people from each of these catagories, German immigrants created anxiety on each of these counts. The unchurched among them, although no more numerous than either of the other two groups, however, became the major subjects of nativist concern. Some of their views conjured up memories of the French radicals of half a century earlier and elicited an equally vehement attack.

Unchurched German immigrants had been constantly arriving before 1848, but their number, at least that of the radical element among them, considerably increased after that date. There was a high degree of

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1855, p. 32.

[2] Pertaining to those who fostered evangelism.

correlation between political and religious liberalism in Germany.[1] So probably a high percentage of the political refugees who flocked to America after the abortive revolution of 1848 were unchurched. Estimates of their proportion to the total German immigrant population are usually placed at about one-third.[2]

American nativists were especially alarmed about the presence of this group in the United States, because these unchurched Germans wielded influence far beyond the proportion of their numbers. Since political liberalism in Germany flourished particularly among the intellectuals, German immigration during the years immediately following 1848 contained a generous sprinkling of university-educated people. Being articulate and aggressive, they utilized the freedom of the press in America to propagate their views. The number of German newpapers in the country nearly doubled (from 70 to 133) in the four years between 1848 and 1852 alone,[3] and for a time "the rationalists, freethinkers, and atheists among the Forty-Eighters"[4] controlled half of them. An American Baptist source placed the number of newpapers at 250 and maintained that only ten or twelve of these were religious and evangelical, nearly the same number were supported by advocating downright infidelity and assailing every thing religious, and the remainder were political or miscellaneous in purpose but decidedly unfriendly to religion.[5]

A segment of this group were merely indifferent to the church and

---

[1]E.g., Wittke, op. cit., p. 222. [2]E.g., Ibid., p. 225.

[3]Ibid., p. 230. [4]Ibid., p. 195. [5]NYBUME An. Rep., 1852, p. 33.

to religion. They had been left cold by the rationalism which had pervaded much of the state church of Germany and by the meaningless formalism and ritualism of the services conducted by pastors who no longer believed all that they were obligated to teach.[1] Increased party strife within the church furthered their alienation.[2] They did not deny the benefits to be derived from Christianity but questioned their particular need of them and denied all religious obligations. With the added disruption of their relationship with the church caused by immigration, they simply remained aloof from churches in America.

Others among the unchurched, however, were aggressively opposed to the church, the clergy, and, frequently, to all forms of organized religion.[3] To some extent rationalism had nurtured reaction to the orthodoxy, especially the confessionalism, of conservative Lutherans and to the obscurantism of many Pietists, but probably most of this anti-ecclesiastical sentiment stemmed from political developments in Germany. Because of the close relationship of the church and the state, opposition to the state readily extented to the church as well. Thus, as political liberalism and reaction to post-1815 conservatism developed, a corresponding reaction emerged against the ecclesiastical paternalism of the German government and the entire consistorial regime of the government-

---

[1]German converts to Anglo-American denominations frequently gave this reason for their alienation from the state churches of Germany.

[2]Karl Heussi, Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte (12th ed.; Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1960), p. 469.

[3]Carl E. Schneider, The German Church on the American Frontier: A Study in the Rise of Religion Among the Germans of the West . . . 1840-1866 (St. Louis: Eden Publishing House, 1939), pp. 6, 33-4.

subsidized clergy. The latter, contemptuously called Pfaffen, were regarded by many liberals as despicable tyrants whose one aim was to fleece their innocent victims and subject them to the bondage of ecclesiasticism. As a society of German liberals in America declared:

> Any religious, or, more yet, church-related direction we banish from us. Our statute gives evidence, that those churches which, in their religious tyranny, have brought unspeakable misery upon mankind, will find us arrayed against them in motive and principle, with implacable enmity. Not faith, but scientific knowledge; not revelation, but free learning; not obedience towards the Lord, but freedom, is our saviour; the firm rock of all our efforts and of all our hopes. We have examined the works of all the churches, and we regard them all, with their partly ignorant and partly hypocritical bishops, priests, and parsons (Catholic and Protestant) as the worst foes of mankind, and to combat them the highest duty of every thinking man.[1]

While most of these reactionaries abandoned the church altogether, others, both in Germany and America, began freie Gemeinde, independent congregations which severed themselves entirely from the established regime, rejected its ritual and dogma, and tried to reconcile science and religion.[2] At one time there were nearly seventy-five such congregations in the Ohio Valley alone.[3] Much of this anti-ecclesiasticism was brought to America by the Forty-Eighters and was vigorously propagated and debated in the free press before it gradually dissipated.

Extremists among this group of the unchurched not only opposed the church's institutional structures but its theology as well. Drawing on the thought of philosophers such as Feuerbach and Friedrich Nietzsche, they rejected all revealed religion, denouncing it as a figment of the

---

[1] Home Mission Record, Feb. 1854, p. 18.

[2] Wittke, op. cit., p. 222; Heussi, op. cit., pp. 478-9.

[3] Wittke, loc. cit.

imagination, an opium of the people, and "the most fearful curse with which the earth has ever been visited."[1] Both in Germany and America, they scorned and ridiculed Christianity, frequently countering it with violence.[2] Its supernaturalism, creeds, and theological systems were summarily dismissed as unworthy of acceptance by intelligent people. In their place were erected the new gods of man and science. As one society of freethinkers affirmed in its statement of fundamental principles:

> a. The only source of all truth on earth is man.
> b. Each theory of a supernatural revelation rests on error and falsehood.
> c. The highest court, in everything known or to be known, is only the free science.
> d. The highest truth is man, and the acknowledgement of his power to know the truth as well as pure virtue and pure happiness. The best religion is that which man and his elevation to his true nature makes the steady object of its animated aspiration.[3]

Christian ethics received somewhat more sympathetic treatment. One German newspaper is reported to have advocated "the supreme worth of sensual gratification."[4] But, as a rule, what seemed wise, moral, and just in the ethics of Christianity and other religions was retained.[5]

The presence of such elements in the country was naturally a

---

[1] NYBUME An. Rep., 1852, p. 34, quoting the New York Recorder, Sept. 1851, n.p.

[2] Ibid. See also Home Mission Record, Aug. 1855, p. 32.

[3] Quoted in Home Mission Record, Feb. 1854, p. 18. See also NYBUME An. Rep., 1852, p. 34.

[4] Home Mission Record, Nov. 1853, p. 8.

[5] In fact, religion was redefined as "the rational search for happiness," and "ethical culture and the search for truth, virtue, and happiness" were regarded as the prime object of living (Wittke, op. cit., p. 223).

XUM

source of great anxiety for American Baptists. Revolutionary France had satisfactorily demonstrated for them that infidelity leads to moral degradation.[1] Since, as they believed, religion and morality are the basis of national character, moral corruption could only lead to the collapse of the social order.[2] German irreligion and infidelity, therefore, were believed to be eating away at the very foundation of American society, from its family life to its political institutions.[3] To eradicate these menaces, therefore, was a matter of first priority. For, "to the burning, quenchless desire to save the lost, and bring a revolted world to God, there was added now the love of country, and all the instincts of self-preservation."[4]

German Catholics, as all Roman Catholics in America, were thought to be almost equally as ominous for America religion and society. American Baptists did not consider them as entirely infidel or heathen (although at times they resorted to such epithets as "idolaters, haters of God, and children of wrath"[5]) but generally as anti-Christian, superstitious, and vile, "in perishing need of the Gospel."[6] As evidence for their allegation, they frequently pointed to moral destitution in predominantly Catholic countries. One article in the Home Mission Record,

---

[1]Home Mission Record, Aug. 1856, p. 29; ABHMS An. Rep. 1846, p. 17.

[2]Ibid., May 1856, p. 17. [3]Ibid., Aug. 1856, p. 29.

[4]ABHMS An. Rep., 1855, p. 75.

[5]Home Mission Record, March 1852, p. 26.

[6]Ibid., March 1854, p. 21. See also ibid., Aug. 1859, pp. 29-30.

for example, cited numerous statistics about various European cities to show that: "No matter how genial the climate, nor how fertile the soil, the blight of moral death, filth, destitution, and crime is inflicted upon every country where the Romish system is in the ascendant."[1]

The same kind of statistics were used to allege a Roman Catholic threat to morality and social stability in America. One writer contended, for example, that, while Catholics constituted only about one-tenth of the American population in 1853, three-fourth of all the felons who ended their career of crime on the gallows in the United States, during the preceeding twenty years, were Roman Catholic by religion.[2] If unchecked, many thought, Catholicism would plunge America into immorality, crime, and general social disaster.

On the basis of Catholic opposition to the use of the King James version of the Bible in public schools, many American Baptists, as others among their Protestant countrymen,[3] concluded that Catholics rejected the Bible itself. One American Baptist pastor argued: "There is scarcely a pope from Boniface III down through all the Hildebrands and Borgias, to the present pontiff, who has not condemned, proscribed and banished either the Bible, or those who have loved its truth."[4] Since Catholics on a few occasions burned Bibles placed in the public schools by the American Bible Society, he concluded that the spirit of the whole church was crowded into a single sentence from the official organ of Bishop

---

[1] Ibid., Aug. 1857, p. 30. [2] Ibid., Aug. 1853, p. 48.

[3] Billington, op. cit., pp. 42-3, 157.

[4] ABHMS An. Rep., 1855, p. 77.

Hughes, which asserted that "the Bible Society is the deepest scheme ever laid by Satan, in order to delude the human family, and bring them to his eternal possession."[1]

What frightened American Baptists most about the increase of Roman Catholics in America, however, was the fear that they might gain ecclesiastical supremacy and use their power to suppress religious liberty. As early as 1834 the corresponding secretary of the ABHMS cautioned that popery

> seeks to retrieve in America what it has lost in Europe. While its nature is really and professedly immutable, its outward form is cameleon, and with jesuitical cunning and adroitness adapts itself to all changes of circumstance. It is a system of despotism exerted over the bodies and souls of its votaries, and can never be made to agree with republicanism. Its ascendancy in this country would produce a change in the form of our government, effecting the demolition of our free institutions. . . .[2]

Nevertheless, at that time it was still widely held that "the Catholics are to be considered merely as a religious sect, like the different sects of Protestant Christians, and that the question of their increase in the country is as unimportant as that of any of those."[3]

The appearance of Samuel Morse's Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the U.S.,[4] in 1834, and the volumes of anti-Catholic literature which it inspired convinced many people otherwise. Thereafter almost every Catholic move was suspected of being a part of a monstrous

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Ibid., 1834, p. 31. [3]Ibid., 1835, p. 27.

[4](New York: n.p., 1834). Morse attempted to establish that the founding of the Leopoldine Stiftung, A Catholic missionary society in Austria, involved a plot against the liberties of the United States. Seven editions of his book were issued by 1855.

conspiracy to establish a preponderance of Catholic influence and power capable of reshaping both American ecclesiastical and political institutions on a European model.

Like a large number of other American Protestants, Baptists were persuaded that Rome was master-minding such a plot and that it was for this purpose that European Catholics were encouraged to emigrate to America, that most priests were aliens and American priests were trained in Rome,[1] that Catholics in America were lending all their energies to proselytize Protestants, and that huge sums of money were sent from the Old World for building altars, cathedrals, and educational institutions in America.[2]

To make matters worse, some Catholics substantiated these fears. Whether accurately or not, the Boston Pilot was quoted as saying--and many believed it--"Catholics should control and sway the destinies of the far West."[3] Similarly Bishop England was alleged to have written to the Pope, "Within thirty years the Protestant heresy will come to an end. If we can secure the West and South, we will take care of New England."[4]

Should Rome gain a commanding voice in American ecclesiastical and political affairs, American Baptists were certain that they would be deprived of their highly cherished religious liberty. It appeared self-evident to them that Roman Catholicism was utterly incompatible with both civil and religious liberty[5] and therefore would not tolerate Protestants

---

[1]Home Mission Record, Oct. 1859, p. 38. [2]Ibid., Nov. 1852, p. 9. [3]Ibid., Sept. 1855, p. 33. [4]Ibid. [5]Ibid., Oct. 1852, p. 8.

if it were in a position to suppress them. Again, the papal encyclical of August 15, 1852 itself could be quoted as exclaiming: "The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defence of liberty of conscience, is a most pestilential error--a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a State."[1] And another Catholic source baldly asserted:

> You ask if he (the Pope) were lord in the land, and you were in a minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would we do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you; if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you--possibly he might even hang you--but, be assured of one thing; he would never tolerate you for the sake of the "glorious principles' of civil and religious liberty.[2]

Religious liberty, it appeared, was only tolerated by Catholics until ecclesiastical despotism could be established. The central aim of the Church of Rome in America, it seemed, was "to overthrow our free institutions, to destroy the noblest temple of Liberty ever erected, raised by the toil and sacrifice of our fathers and cemented with their blood,"[3] and that made Baptist blood boil with rage.

German Protestants also caused American Baptists considerable nativistic fear. While they avoided some of the extremes of their unchurched countrymen, they were generally opposed to the puritan and pietistic forms of Christianity prevailent in mid-nineteenth century America. Being accustomed to the professionalism and formalism of the German state churches, they were repulsed by lay, and other poorly

---

[1]Cited in ibid., Feb. 1855, p. 12.

[2]Cited in ibid. See also ibid., Sept. 1855, p. 33.

[3]Ibid., July 1856, p. 26. See also ABHMS An. Rep., 1845, p. 15.

qualified, preachers; the new measures; and by the sentimental, informal, and legalistic tenor of American Christianity as a whole.[1] To many American Protestants at the time, however, they appeared to be scorning Christianity itself.

Their sharpest clash with American religious opinion came on the the issues of temperance and Sabbath observance. Many of them loved their beer and beer gardens. Even though climatic and social conditions in America led to heavier drinking here than was the custom in Germany, these "beer gardens and wine parlors were orderly places, where a drunken customer would have been promptly ejected either by the proprietor or by his fellow quests."[2] To American Baptists, though, German drinking habits and places, particularly when combined with the Sabbath, represented the epitome of moral degradation. Jonathon Goings, the first corresponding secretary of the ABHMS, was a pronounced temperance man, and under his inspiration missionaries of the society gave increasing attention to the temperance cause.[3] By 1838 they were giving it their "hearty support," delivering addresses on the subject, founding temperance societies in their congregations, and securing pledges of total abstinence. Some years, in fact, they established more societies than churches, and in the decade from 1842 to 1852 they secured 15,263 signatures to pledges in

---

[1]E.g., Schneider, op. cit., pp. 39, 40, 225, 273.

[2]Wittke, op. cit., p. 213.

[3]American Baptist Home Mission Society, Baptist Home Missions in North America . . . 1832-1882 (New York: Baptist Home Mission Rooms, 1883), p. 531; ABHMS An. Rep., 1838, p. 29.

missionary churches alone.[1] During the following decade that number dropped considerably,[2] but the reason was at least in part that the practice was so universally observed that pledges became unnecessary. When the German turner societies opposed these efforts on the grounds that they were an invasion of personal liberty, American Baptists were convinced the more that the crusade must continue.

The clash between the Continental Sunday and the Puritan Sabbath was equally as severe. The long-standing German custom of utilizing the Sabbath for visiting, engaging in sports and games, making music, talking politics, and drinking had excited no ordinary degree of concern among Americans who adhered to the dominant and cherished tradition of strict sabbath observance. When in the 1850's the Germans became so audacious as to resist Sunday closing laws by political means, American Baptists again felt called to action.[3] Since the state of religion and morals was a widely accepted index to the state of society generally, these disruptive influences were seen as a potential threat to all of the nation's institutions. Moreover, if the Christian life is manifested by its fruits, American Baptists concluded from the customs of German Protestants in America that these people were not only a threat to certain American religious customs but were without the truth and in need of the Gospel itself.

Besides appearing to endanger certain religious beliefs, customs,

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1852, p. 29. [2] Ibid., 1862, pp. 27-8.

[3] Home Mission Record, Feb. 1854, p. 20.

and institutions in America, German-Americans were thought to be a threat to this country's basic political principles and structures as well. At mid-century this was particularly true of the 1848'ers. Many of them were radical reformers and revolutionaries who aimed to change the whole world.[1] Having failed at their attempts to begin such a movement in Germany and being driven from their homeland, they transferred their base of operation to America.

Their strategies varied. Some had simply chosen to come to America for political refuge until their forces could be recouped in Germany. An educated minority dreamed of a separate German state in America. Still more ambitious designers hoped to make all of this country their utopia and to use it as the center of world revolution. The latter plan called for a radical change in the political, social, and economic institutions of the country. Among other things, the Constitution, president, and senate were to be abolished; slavery, Bible reading, formal Christianity, and the Puritan Sabbath done away with; and the common people vested with the complete right to rule.[2] Despite its revolutionary character, it was widely propagated in German newspapers, and innumerable revolutionary societies were founded to implement it.[3] Knowing of these plans, it is small wonder that patriotic Americans feared for "all civil government and all social happiness,"[4] and at times bristled with rage over these ingrate foreigners.

---

[1]Wittke, op. cit., p. 193; Billington, op. cit., p. 328.

[2]Billington, op. cit., p. 329. [3]Ibid.

[4]Home Mission Record, Aug. 1855, p. 32.

XUM

German Catholics, together with all Roman Catholics, were also suspected of political intrigue and were equally feared. American Baptists, therefore, followed the numerical[1] and institutional growth of Catholics in America with anxious alarm.[2] But even more ominous was the thought that the suspects had the right to vote. Some American Baptists remained unruffled even at the height of nativist unrest during the early 1850's, because Catholics still constituted less than ten per cent of the population and the entire free spirit of American life and thought was believed to be against them.[3] Others, however, were quick to reply that

> the almost universal cry, No danger, makes the danger! It was when Samson was asleep, in vain confidence, that he was shorn of his power by the snare of his enemies. A harlot betrayed him. And it is not impossible for the mother of harlots to betray American Protestants.[4]

Because of their numerical concentration in certain cities and larger geographical areas, Catholics already held a balance of power in some of these places and were securing representation in the higher offices of the land. In fact, as early as 1850, the immigrant vote, a large percentage of which was Catholic at that time, helped to elect the president himself.[5] If that vote were to continue increasing at the rate it had during the 1850's, it appeared inevitable that the new Americans would eventually rule the land.

What made this prospect particularly fearful prior to the Civil War

---

[1]Which amounted to approximately 3,000,000 by 1865.

[2]Home Mission Record, Nov. 1852, p. 9; ibid., July 1857, p. 25; ibid., March 1858, p. 9.

[3]Ibid., March 1854, pp. 21, 24. [4]Ibid., April 1854, p. 27.

[5]Billington, op. cit., p. 325; Home Mission Record, July 1857, p. 25.

XUM

was the large percentage of Catholics among the immigrants and the continued surmise that Rome was logically, theologically, and historically opposed to what had become regarded as sacred constitutional principles. There was an element of truth in this fear, and when occasionally some Catholic papers made bold attacks on these principles,[1] they strongly reinforced the prevailing suspicions. Consequently, many American Baptists persisted in the belief that "the papists have set before them the distinct and fixed design of gaining the ascendancy over protestant Christianity in this country, and of ultimately securing the government as the tool of this design" and that "all the intelligence, zeal and pecuniary resources of the great papal colossus are taxed for the realization of this scheme."[2]

All Catholics, moreover, were assumed to be aiding and abetting these subversive plans, because most of them were foreigners by birth, believed to be ignorant of civil and religious liberties, obligated to obey the Church in political as well as religious matters, and under the constant instruction and blindly following the guidance of foreign leaders, who themselves were "trained under the restraints of a foreign despotism, owing allegiance to a foreign potentate, to a wide extent, exercising the rights of American citizens,"[3] and bartering the political power of their

---

[1]See quotations in Home Mission Record, Feb. 1856, p. 8 and ibid., Sept. 1856, p. 33.

[2]Ibid., Sept. 1857, p. 33.

[3]ABHMS An. Rep., 1852, p. 36. See also ibid., 1853, p. 24; Home Mission Record, Feb. 1856, p. 8.

XUM

parishioners for favors and protection for Catholicism.[1]

It was in response to such fears that the executive committee of the ABHMS in 1835 called upon the American Baptist churches

> to engage with renewed ardor, and with more entire unanimity, and with increased liberality, and in a spirit of unconquerable perseverance, in the cause of Home Missions. They do this under the most solemn and settled conviction, that if this republic is to continue and to prosper--if our free institutions are to bless generations to come--if Protestant Christianity is to be perserved in its purity--if this entire population is to be educated--if the precepts and purposes of Christ are to be heeded by his sworn followers--if his banner is to wave in peaceful and holy triumph over our goodly land--that much, very much is to be achieved by the direct and indirect influence of Home Missions, as undertaken and administered by American Christians.[2]

For about another decade from the time this appeal was made, more energy was expended trying to destroy Catholicism than in converting those who adhered to that faith. By the mid-1840's, reflecting the tendency in the broader nativist movement,[3] American Baptists began to reverse that approach. The intensity of their motivation, however, was unchanged. As they evaluated the Catholic threat, there was "no time to spear, no intellect, will, money, or whatever other means we can command to suffer to lie idle while the question of papal or Christian ascendancy in the future of this country is undecided."[4]

Although the remaining German immigrants were not engaged in or

---

[1]Billington, op. cit., p. 327; Home Mission Record, Nov. 1852, p. 9.

[2]ABHMS An. Rep., 1835, p. 28. See also Home Mission Record, Sept. 1849, pp. 1, 10.

[3]Billington, op. cit., p. 245.

[4]Home Mission Record, Sept., 1857, p. 33.

suspected of political subversion, they, too, aroused considerable fear among nativists and patriots. For many political conservatives (particularly in the East) universal white suffrage was threatening enough; to permit Hans, Karl, and Ludwig to go to the polls was positively appalling. Even though this segment of German-Americans were generally patriotic, a judiciary committee reported in 1845 that their vote was contributing to gross political corruption. Politicians who placed party advantages above public welfare were using them, together with other innocent new arrivals, in devious political manuvers. Just before election day immigrants were being naturalized in droves--fraudulent citizenship papers being obtained by judges and court officials who were tools of the political machines--their vote was bought--often on ballots printed and premarked by party organizations--and they were even shifted about from one voting place to another as repeaters.[1] When and where these people constituted a balance of power, therefore, they could be used to undermine the entire democratic process and system.

Already prior to the Civil War, many American Baptists were also beginning to fear the immigrants' influence upon American economic and social conditions.[2] But their major concerns were clearly the religious and political ones which have been described.

If these adverse influences were not neutralized or counteracted,

---

[1]Billington, op. cit., pp. 198, 207; Wittke, op. cit., pp. 183-4; Colin B. Goodykoontz, Home Missions on the American Frontier (Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1939), p. 223.

[2]E.g., Home Mission Record, Aug. 1856, p. 29.

American Baptists were persuaded the German immigrants, together with the rest of the foreign element in the country, "will ultimately destroy our free and happy institutions, and will add our name to the long history of nations that have been plunged from a state of high prosperity and freedom into the depths of degradation."[1] American institutions were generally regarded as God-given and the envy of the world, but, at the same time, it was acknowledged that they were provisional and could be lost or reclaimed by the giver. If the corrupting influences and subversive activities of the foreign element were unchecked, it was truly and greatly feared that the interrelated religious and political institutions of America would be sapped of their vitality and life and the American Zion would be brought to an untimely death.[2] In light of America's potential mission and destiny, such a thought provoked strong reaction.

The most obvious antidote to the un-American influences of the immigrants was Americanization. In its broadest context, this meant that the multifarious new Americans

> must be moulded into the same type of character--must be imbued with the same national spirit--must be pervaded with the great American idea--must feel the pulses of the great American heart thrilling its life currents into every throbbing bosom.[3]

That is, they had to be divested of their ethnic distinctives and assimilated into the older stock of Americans "in feeling, in intelligence, in habit, in language, and above all, in Religion."[4] But under the pre-

---

[1] Ibid., Nov. 1852, p. 10. See also ABHMS An. Rep., 1847, p. 19.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1845, pp. 15-6; ibid., 1849, p. 73; Home Mission Record, Sept. 1850, p. 49; ibid., March 1852, p. 26.

[3] ABPS An. Rep., 1855, p. 57. [4] Home Mission Record, Oct. 1857, p. 5.

vailing conditions, it meant primarily bringing the stranger-population to an understanding and appreciation of American religion and democracy.

How was that to be done? Many means were suggested. But American Baptists were unwavering in their opinion that

> on all the devices of man, by which he has sought perfection and happiness in his individual or social state--whether by education, or government, or new social and new philosophical theories--on all these God has written, and human experience has written, "mene, mene tekel, upharsin."[1]

And before the Civil War only a few trusted the assimilating power of the Anglo-Saxon race alone to assure the permanence of America's inheritance or even the "unseen, omnipotent hand" to silently mould "these masses mysteriously and Americanize the whole."[2] Instead, they maintained that "the glorious gospel of the blessed God" is "the one mighty instrumentality" "to counteract the influence of such errors--to preserve the social fabric--to sustain the body politic--to extend the reign of peace and love by Jesus Christ."[3] Only the religion of the Bible and true conversion generate the sound public morality and private virtue upon which the stability of the entire social order depends.[4] Only if the gospel is received and obeyed, will knowledge increase, righteousness prevail, good and reliable citizens be raised up, and the republic be safe.[5]

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1852, p. 71. See also ibid., 1855, p. 75, 81.

[2] Ibid., 1851, p. 72.

[3] Ibid., 1852, p. 71. See also ibid., 1844, pp. 15-6; ibid., 1845, pp. 13-5.

[4] Ibid., 1851, p. 56; ibid., 1860, p. 52; ibid., 1861, p. 44; NYBUME An. Rep., 1852, p. 35; ABPS An. Rep., 1855, p. 57.

[5] ABHMS An. Rep., 1863, p. 31; Home Mission Record, March 1854, pp. 21-2.

XUM

American life and social structures were so closely identified with Christianity (Protestantism) that it was believed, "No man can adopt this [the American] Constitution or any other aspect of American culture without adopting the Bible upon which it was founded, at least in its grand outlines of principles,"[1] and vice versa. So securing faith commitments to Christ was held inevitably to lead to patriotism.

What American Baptists were attempting, therefore, was to use evangelism as a means of safeguarding American social institutions; religious and otherwise. Believing that their liberties and free institutions could be traced to the principles of the gospel, that these were being threatened by foreign influences in the country, and that the gospel provided the surest safeguard against this danger, by maintaining or restoring the healthy moral and religious conditions on which the welfare of the entire social order rested, they proposed to evangelize the immigrants for the express purpose of defending America's cherished heritage and insuring its divinely ordained destiny. Viewed positively, they aimed to Americanize the foreigners.

It would have been sacrilegious to admit that the Americanization of the aliens was more important than the salvation of their souls. Nor would the immigrants have taken well to a campaign explicitly designed to divest them of their ethnic distinctives to bring them into conformity with American values which they did not yet fully share. This ulterior motive, therefore, was generally subsumed under the broader umbrella of

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1851, p. 72.

evangelization.

While evangelism, therefore, was the most ostensible motive for the American Baptist mission to German-Americans, Americanization was nevertheless its ultimate purpose. That is not to say that the American Baptists were indifferent to the spiritual welfare of the immigrants, but rather than they viewed evangelism as also a means to a further end. And from the fact that they consistently advocated the mission in their own circles for this further reason, one can only conclude that it probably was the strongest factor in their motivation. In any case, Americanization played a much greater role in their motivation for home missions among the immigrant peoples than has been acknowledged to date.

PART II

THE MIDDLE PERIOD

1863-1893

CHAPTER 4

THE PATTERN OF MOTIVATION CONTINUED

The pattern of motivation which led American Baptists to undertake their mission to German-Americans prior to the Civil War remained basically the same for three more decades. During the late 1850's and early 1860's, nativistic concerns were largely overshadowed by the issue of slavery, with the result that the Americanization of immigrants lost some of its urgency. That may be another reason why the extent to which this anxiety motivated nineteenth-century Anglo-American missions to the immigrants has not been fully recognized. A closer examination, however, reveals that eagerness to Americanize the aliens remained a major motivation for home missions to these people. As a result of the slavery question, the urgency of Americanization was partly eclipsed for a time; and with changing patterns of nativism, the reasons for Americanization were slightly modified. But American Baptists, at least, were still clearly aiming both to evangelize and Americanize the immigrants.

The subject of evangelism was only infrequently discussed in American Baptist denominational literature during this period. That does not mean that they were less sensitive to their responsibilities in this regard. On the contrary, the reason seems to be that the views developed on the subject before the Civil War were so universally and unreservedly accepted that further indoctrination in them or even clarification of

them was considered superfluous.[1] The phenomenal expansion of their home and foreign missions during this period alone would bear this out.

Their home mission efforts were still directed primarily at native Americans on the frontier, but the newcomers were gradually being given added attention. As a missionary-minded people, the American Baptists were moved by the conviction that most of the immigrants were at best nominal Christians, "sprinkled in their infancy, taught to believe they were born Christians, and never need to be converted."[2] "Whose godliness," it was believed, "is a form rather than a force, whose righteousness consists chiefly in observance of days and rites rather than in a spirit right before God," millions of whom "are lost as truly as the Pagans."[3] Their spiritual welfare demanded that the "gospel" be preached to them. For the leaders of the ABHMS, therefore, it was an incontrovertible fact that "to the extent of our ability it is our duty to evangelize these people."[4]

German-Americans numbered even more prominently among this stranger-population than they had before. Economic disarrangement in Germany, the burden of compulsory military duty, the Prussian wars, and ecclesiastical strife,[5] corresponding with economic prosperity and opportunity in America

---

[1]References to the subject were always made in such a matter-of-fact fashion, one can only conclude that there was general agreement on the subject. By 1882 anti-mission Baptists were "looked upon as fossils of a by-gone day" (ABHMS An. Rep., 1882, p. 69).

[2]Ibid., 1865, p. 39. [3]Ibid., 1882, p. 59. See also ibid., p. 119.

[4]Ibid., 1889, p. 49.

[5]Faust, op. cit., I, 582-3, 586-7; Wittke, op. cit., pp. 188, 210; BHMM, May 1882, p. 131.

(forcefully promoted by land, railroad, and shipping companies) kept immigration from Germany flowing strongly. From 1866 to 1874 it averaged nearly 120,000 per year. During the financial depression that followed, it dropped sharply but only to rise to its highest crest from 1880 to 1893. In 1882 alone over a quarter of a million arrived. As a result, in 1890 the immigration from Germany amounted to one half or more of the total immigration in six states and a quarter or more in twenty others, far above that of any other single foreign-speaking nationality.[1] This tremendous increase of Germans in America in itself demanded that greater consideration be given to their evangelization.

In addition, a large segment of the resulting German-American population was entirely unchurched. Those who arrived before the Civil War and neglected or refused to affiliate with any Christian church in America were by no means all assimilated yet, although the intensity of their irreligion and anti-ecclesiasticism had waned somewhat. And more of their kind continued to arrive. As a result of the Revolution of 1848 and the political reaction which followed it, confessionalism won the favor of the provincial governments in Germany and gained predominance in the theological faculties of the universities and the populace generally, largely suppressing the remnants of rationalism.[2] Concurrently and subsequently, however, biblical criticism, continued anti-clericalism, scientific materialism, the growing conflict of science and religion, and socialism resulted in increasing secularization and the alienation of

---

[1] DS, July 5, 1899, p. 427.

[2] Heussi, op. cit., pp. 164, 166.

the educated class and urban workers from the church and from Christianity itself.[1] While some of the reasons for alienation from the Church changed, therefore, the fact remained and became even more widespread, resulting in a larger percentage of the total population in this catagory. And, naturally, these people emigrated to America as well as any other Germans--probably in even larger numbers because they had already severed their religious ties with the homeland.

The large numbers of these unchurched people added to the necessity of evangelizing the immigrants. But they were not the only objects of that concern. American Baptists still firmly believed that German Catholics and most German Protestants also needed, "as truly as the Pagan, spiritual guides to instruct them in the truth about the new birth and the way of salvation."[2] Therefore, what American Baptists were saying about the evangelization of the immigrants generally applied particularly to German-Americans and continued to serve as one of the motives for the German-American mission.

For a time, the need to Americanize the immigrants, in addition to evangelizing them, was partially eclipsed by the slavery issue and caused to ebb by the immigrants' clear denomstration of their patriotism in the demanding exigencies of war. "All over the country foreign-born Americans flocked to the colors. Five hundred thousand of them served in the Union

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 427, 469; Carlton J. H. Hayes, A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900 (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941), pp. 123-36.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1880, p. 34.

armies alone, often organized in their own companies, regiments, and even divisions."[1] As a result,

> the war completed the ruin of organized nativism by absorbing xenophobes and immigrants in a common cause. Now the foreigner had a new prestige; he was a comrade-at-arms. The clash that alienated sections reconciled their component nationalities.[2]

Thus was begun what John Higham has called the "age of confidance" in the history of American nativism.[3]

In proportion to their numbers, German-Americans contributed more soldiers than any other national element of the population.[4] Some estimates have placed the number as high as 216,000 in the Union Army and 70,000 in the Confederate.[5] Although German turner societies had generally sympathized with the religious and political radicals among their countrymen and had been the most militant opponents of nativism, some of their regiments were among the first to respond to Lincoln's call for volunteers,[6] and before the war had ended over sixty per cent of their membership had taken up arms in defense of the Union.[7] In addition, "German societies gave numerous concerts and entertainments to raise funds for the troops."[8] It is true that numerous and varied incentives were offered to resident aliens for signing up with the military. But, after all due allowance is

---

[1]John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955), pp. 12-3.

[2]Ibid., p. 13. [3]Ibid., p. 12.

[4]Faust, op. cit., II, 126; BHMM, Nov. 1891, p. 327.

[5]Wittke, op. cit., pp. 250-1. [6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., p. 221. [8]Ibid., p. 251.

made for such ulterior incentives, the fact remains that the record of German-Americans in the war was a striking demonstration of their loyalty and a gratifying reply to those nativists who had questioned their patriotism during the pre-war years. "On many a bloody battle-field they had stood side by side with native-born citizens, fighting, bleeding, dying, for the same starry banner, in the same righteous and holy cause."[1]

In the post-war years they further acquired a solid reputation for being intelligent, industrious, frugal, prosperous, honest, law-abiding, and steadfast. Americans generally regarded them as being among the better class of immigrants and as valuable citizens.

This change in attitude toward German-Americans, however, was not so complete that American Baptists continued their mission to this group of immigrants only to evangelize them. As has been indicated, that was one of the motives involved but not the only one, nor necessarily even the dominant one. Even though nativism subsided considerably during and following the Civil War, American Baptists still had a strong sense of national destiny and abundant fear of the immigrants' menace to its fulfilment.

Indeed, their vision of America's mission and destiny was still expanding. Already at the outset of this period, they regularly described the nation's size, wealth, religion, and civil institutions with superlatives. And when an increasing number of intellectuals concurred with the theory that a fusion of races produces a superior people, many

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1865, p. 32.

American Baptists came further to believe that through diverse immigration and the mixing of races in America God was "bringing forth His crowning work in a race intellectually and physically superior to any the world has yet seen."[1] Even intellectuals among them did not hesitate to predict: "No wildest visionary has ever begun to comprehend what America is to be."[2]

Dreams of American's role in the world at large were especially growing. It was widely held that the course of empires had moved progressively westward through the course of history--from Asia to Europe, and from the Mediterranean and the Rhine and America, beyond which is nothing save the setting sun--and that "the circuit of progess is at last complete."[3] America now held the key to the future.

Before 1893 few Americans thought in terms of a political empire for America. But they observed the diffusion of the English language and anticipated, according to the dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, that "the English-speaking race is soon to own this earth, and American ideas are to dominate the English-speaking race."[4] The American ideas referred to were particularly American views of civil and religious liberty. In the words of another American Baptist:

> American is the hope of the world. The great experiment of human liberty, which is being tried here on so vast a scale, concerns every lover of freedom the world over. The welfare of humanity is involved in the issue. The failure of the Republic would be an unspeakable calamity fraught with woe for the race.[5]

If America failed, it was thought, the world will fail. Hence, America

---

[1] BHMM, Sept. 1887, p. 235. [2] Ibid., Sept. 1[illegible], p. 305.

[3] Ibid., Sept. 1886, p. 211. [4] Ibid., Sept. 189[illegible], p. 305.

[5] Ibid., Sept. 1893, p. 290.

not only had an inconceivably magnificent destiny as a nation but also an enormous responsibility and mission to the rest of the world.

American Christianity ranked prominently in this mission to the world. A growing number of Americans were persuaded that God had providentially supplied this country with the geographic, constitutional, political, financial, educational, and religious resources in order to cover the earth with the glory of God as waters cover the sea.[1] In other words, it was their responsibility to Christianize the world. Many thoughtful minds still firmly believed that America was the valley of decision for the age-old battle between the forces of truth and error, good and evil,[2] so that in America, Christianity itself was on trial. "Christianity failing in America, it is irretrievably doomed in Africa and Asia. Christianity puissant in America, it will conquer the world for Christ."[3]

In order to accomplish this gigantic mission, therefore, the base of operation had to be secured first. If the battle was lost at home, American Baptists thought, it most surely would be lost abroad. And securing the home base during this period, they believed, called for particular attention to the New West.[4] With the center of population having nearly reached the meridan of Cincinnati by 1870 and that of Indianapolis by 1880, it appeared evident that the center of power--commercial, political, and religious--would steadily drift westward, too,

---

[1] Ibid., Sept. 1887, p. 235; ABHMS An. Rep., 1887, p. 17.

[2] BHMM, Sept. 1886, pp. 109-10. [3] Ibid., Sept. 1892, p. 305.

[4] West of the Mississippi.

and that the welfare of the whole republic would soon be decided by the people of that region. They would become the ruling part of the nation, and the future of the country would be determined by the dominating moral and intellectual influences of that section.[1]

The task of securing the home base, in turn, was believed to be primarily the responsibility of the churches. Moral causes were still thought to be "shaping the destinies of individuals, of States, and of humanity in the aggregate,"[2] and Christianity was viewed as the best means of achieving sound morals. There was still no question but that religion was the basis of a healthy society;[3] anyone capable of forming an opinion on the subject was expected to see that the permanence and success of the nation's institutions depended upon the religious and moral character of the people.[4] If follows, then, that "the work of a missionary and that of a patriot are identical."[5]

> Every pioneer missionary is a nation saver; every church organized, every meeting-house erected, every Sunday-school formed, every sermon preached, every visit made, every prayer offered, every dollar given to missions adds to the strength of the Republic and promotes the weal of man as well as the glory of God.[6]

And it was as clear to American Baptists as "the axioms of mathematics,"

---

[1]ABHMS An. Rep. 1881, pp. 21-2: ibid., 1886, pp. 33-4; ibid., 1894, pp. 40-1. Home Mission Herald, Feb. 1873, p. 13.

[2]ABHMS An. Rep., 1866, p. 26. See also Home Mission Herald, Sept. 1873, p. 66.

[3]BHMM, Feb., 1893, pp. 35-6.

[4]Ibid., April 1881, p. 77; ABHMS An. Rep., 1886, p. 29.

[5]ABHMS, Baptist Home Missions, p. 52. See also BHMM, Oct. 1893, p. 324.

[6]BHMM, Sept. 1893, p. 290.

that Christianity had saved the nation thus far,[1] and

> if ours would be a lasting empire, the foundations of the State must be laid in Bible principle and verity, and our national progress and development must be inspired and directed by the eternal and vital forces of God's own New Testament truth."[2]

The future of the West, the destiny of the nation, and the welfare of all mankind, therefore, depended on the churches in America.

Believing as they did, American Baptists realized that they were "under the most solemn obligation, moved by every consideration of patriotism and religion, love ofcountry and love of God, to see that the saving health of the Gospel makes itself felt in the life of this nation."[3] Therefore, while they may have resorted to more individualistic methods of achieving their broader social goal after the Civil War, they never lost sight of the goal itself and in fact greatly intensified their efforts to achieve it.

Establishing a sound moral and religious base in the country demanded work among new Americans. If for no other reason, their growing numbers would have necessitated it. Approximately eleven and one half million arrived in the three decades from 1863 to 1893 alone.[4] Because they tended to concentrate in certain regions, as early as 1880, 73 per cent of Wisconsin's population, 71 per cent of Minnesota's, 66 per cent of the Dakotas', and 44 per cent of Nebraska's was of foreign parentage.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., Sept. 1892, p. 300. [2] Ibid., p. 303.

[3] Ibid. [4] Grose, op. cit., pp. 26, 305; Wittke, op. cit., p. xvi.

[5] Richard Hofstadter, William Miller, and Daniel Aaron, The History of a Republic (Egglewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 451.

No National program of moral invigoration could hope to succeed by ignoring such a large segment of the population.

It was also thought necessary to win new Americans to wholesome moral and religious persuasions because they were still suspected of being the greatest threat to the fulfilment of America's destiny. It is true, exponents of nativism were unusually silent during the first two decades following the Civil War. Not only had the newcomers demonstrated their patriotism in the war, but they also proved to be a valuable asset to the country in the post-war geographical, agricultural, and industrial expansion. During the 1860's and 1870's, twenty-five of the thirty-eight states took official action to promote immigration in the hope of economic growth and enrichment.[1] Furthermore, the age of confidence was characterized by a widespread and deep faith in the nation's capacity for assimilation. Yet nativism persisted. At the same time that the immigrant was admitted to be an economic blessing to the country, he was viewed as personally and socially unattractive. "An ethnocentrism that applied largely to 'mere habits of life,' that raised no question of the newcomer's patriotism or his ultimate assimilation, could survive side by side with a generally tolerant and receptive outlook."[2] In reality, therefore, "instead of being liquidated, anti-foreign fears were simply contained."[3] Even in the age of confidence they lingered on. Although any serious eruption of these feelings was smothered by the opportunity for financial profit, they were still festering beneath the surface.

While American Baptists, therefore, were saying and writing much

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., p. 18. [2]Ibid., p. 24. [3]Ibid., p. 28.

less about German-American influences upon the country, their fear of those influences remained a vital factor in their mission to the Germans. Much less was made of the German-American threat to American religion, for instance, but beneath the surface American Baptists still feared that by their Romanism, Lutheranism, and skepticism, Germans "introduce a secular, unchristian element into our civilization, and imperil, by their influence and practice, some of the sacred institutions which lie at the foundation of the Commonwealth,"[1] rendering more heroic and persistant missionary labor among them an urgent duty.[2]

German-American drinking habits and Sunday activities, in particular, continued to disturb American Baptists. The Germans enjoyed their custom of social drinking, and the vast majority of them were quick to defend it against opposition from temperance groups and especially from prohibitionists.[3] At the same time, American Baptists were becoming increasingly opposed to the use of intoxicants.[4] After a lapse of silence on the temperance issue, in 1876 the ABHMS, for instance, again voiced strong opposition to "the use of a traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage,"[5] moved increasingly toward total abstinence, and more strongly endorsed "all right efforts to promote the great and glorious cause of

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1881, p. 22. See also BHMM, Sept. 1889, pp. 247-8, 250 for particular reference to German Catholics.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1881, p. 22; ibid., 1879, p. 31.

[3] Wittke, op. cit., p. 258.

[4] If the ABHMS was representative of the denomination. And there are many reasons to believe that they were.

[5] ABHMS An. Rep., 1876, p. 12.

temperance [including total abstinence], everywhere and among all people."[1] German-Americans were the prime target of such efforts, since they were held responsible for the vast increase in American consumption of beer.[2]

A similar situation developed in regard to the issue of Sabbath observance. Being aware of growing disregard for the Puritan Sabbath, American Baptists increasingly came to its defense. In 1879, for instance, the ABHMS appointed a committee to cooperate with the International Sabbath Association.[3] When a year later the committee reported that

> the alarming and growing prevalence of Sabbath desecration in various forms, by unnecessary railroad travel, by steamboat excursions and picnics, and by liquor-selling on the Lord's day, call loudly for the earnest protests of all our Christian churches and Sunday Schools, for vigorous appeals from pulpit and press, and for more organized, definite, and positive methods of moral opposition, so that this gigantic evil may be circumscribed, and, if possible, entirely suppressed.

and recommended:

> 1. that our pastors preach more frequently on Sabbath observance,
> 2. that our religious newspapers call more frequent attention to this subject, and invite able writers to discuss it in their columns, [and]
> 3. that suitable resolutions on this general subject be passed by all our Associations and State Conventions,

the Society not only adopted the recommendations but appointed a committee to carry them out.[4] Similar resolutions made and actions taken in the following years suggest that it maintained its determination through out

---

[1] Ibid., 1878, p. 26. See also ibid., 1881, p. 36; ibid., 1883, pp. 17-8; ibid., 1885, p. 22; ibid., 1891, p. 10.

[2] BHMM, Dec. 1887, pp. 315-6. [3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1879, p. 17.

[4] Ibid., 1880, p. 21.

the remainder of the period under consideration.[1]

Since German-Americans were early stereotyped as the most notorious desecrators of the Puritan Sabbath, they probably were the chief object of the Society's concern. And to make matters worse, not only were they themselves disregarding American sentiments for the day but their amusements and recreations enticed native Americans into participation and often were even forced upon unwilling communities.[2]

During this period German-Americans also ruffled some feathers by their opposition to public education. They had resisted the public education system from its inception on the theory that a child belongs first to God and the Church, then to his parents, and only lastly to the state. But it was not until after the War that German parochial[3] and private schools were established in vast numbers. The founders of these schools were motivated both by a genuine interest in a sound educational system and a selfish desire to preserve the German language in the United States. To achieve the latter, German-Americans also demanded that their mother tongue be taught in the public schools, and in several states they even secured permission for instruction in the German language (where there was sufficient demand for it).[4] Such maneuvers usually raised the

---

[1]Ibid., 1883, pp. 17-8; ibid., 1888, p. 29; ibid., 1890, p. 12; ibid., 1892, p. 13.

[2]Ibid., 1883, p. 13.

[3]Lutheran churches in America and especially the Missouri Synod developed extensive parchial school systems.

[4]Wittke, op. cit., pp. 332-5.

ire of nativistic American Baptists.[1]

As might be expected, German Catholics came under the sharpest attack for their role in Roman Catholic assaults on the public schools. Catholics, too, were already causing considerable waves prior to the War by pronouncements such as the one in the Chicago Tablet, which instructed the parent with a child in the public school;

> Take him away. Better let him never know how to write his name, or spell his way through the plainest paragraph of a newspaper, or perform the simplest calculation, than become the bond and chained slave of Satan, to rise up at the last day of accounts to curse you in all the unavailing repentance and bitterness of final despair. Take him away, if you do not wish your bed of death tormented with the spectre of a soul, which God has given you as a sacred trust, surrendered to the great enemy of mankind. Take him away, and let him be a boor, a hewer of wood and drawer of water,--let him incur the scorn of the enlightened age,--let him be accounted by lettered infidels and heathens only an ignorant Papist--rather than incur the anger of his God and the loss of his soul. Take him away, let what will be the consequences.[2]

In the heat of pre-war anti-Catholicism, such statements drew strong emotional reactions, but Catholics were still only a small minority of the population and had only a relatively small number of parochial schools. After the Third Plenary Council of 1884, they vastly expanded their parochial school system, in accordance with the directive of the council,[3] and by then they were numerous enough to push their claims on a much broader

---

[1] DS, June 7, 1882, p. 180; BHMM, Dec. 1890, pp. 348-9.

[2] Chicago Tablet, n.d., n.p., quoted in ABHMS An. Rep., 1855, pp. 77-8. See also The Home Evangelist, March 1865, p. 10.

[3] Which decreed: "Near each church, where it does not exist, a parochial school is to be erected within two years from the promulgation of the Council, and is to be maintained in perpetuum, unless the bishop, on account of grave difficulties, judge that a postponement be allowed" (quoted in Clifton E. Olmstead, History of Religion in the United States [Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960], p. 433).

front. In view of these developments and because of their firm devotion to the separation of church and state, American Baptists were greatly aroused by the Catholic demands for state aid of parochial schools during the 1870's and 1880's and especially by the Poughkeepsie, New York and Faribault, Minnesota plans, whereby the boards of education leased Catholic parochial schools, staffed them with Catholic teachers who taught both religious and secular subjects, and paid the operating expenses with public funds.[1] And the feathers really flew when in 1890 the Catholics tried to block the confirmation of General Thomas Morgan, an American Baptist, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, because of his opposition to the use of public funds for Indian schools, seventy per cent of which were Catholic.[2]

During the latter part of this period, German-Americans also created considerable anxiety over their influence on the economic and political institutions of the land. To some extent the consternation resulted from a general resurgence of nativism during the 1880's. For particularly after the publication of the Josiah Strong's Our Country in 1885[3] and Jacob Riis' How the Other Half Lives in 1890[4], immigrants were increasingly used as scapegoats for the mounting tensions between labor and capital, the growing urban and social problems, and virtually all of the nation's ills.[5] American Baptists clearly reflected the same prejudice. As one of them so

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1892, p. 14. [2] BHMM, March 1890, pp. 66-9.

[3] Our Country, Its Possible Future and its Present Crisis (New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 1885).

[4] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890).

[5] Higham, op. cit., pp. 41, 54-5; Hofstadter, Miller, Aaron, op. cit., pp. 512-3.

blatantly alleged in speaking of the nation's perils:

> Romanism, what is it, priest and people alike, but largely a question concerning the foreign population? Intemperance, how it looms up with ever threatening aspect! But it is overwhelmingly a question of the foreign population. The Sabbath, shall we keep it or shall we lose it? is also a question of the foreign population. Mormonism! nine-tenth of the Mormons are foreigners. Socialism! especially in its aggravated forms of communism and anarchism, exclusively a foreign question [etc., etc.].[1]

Being the largest segment of the foreign population, German-Americans received a comparable share of the blame.

To some extent the blame was deserved. Because of their large numbers, German immigrants added substantially to the volume of cheap competitors for American jobs who tended to keep wages down. As early as mid-century, they also began organizing numerous labor unions in the larger cities which were constituted primarily of Germans and began publishing several German labor papers. And for many years afterward they remained prominent in the labor movement by their numbers and leadership.[2]

Many of the same people also became involved in radical political activities. After the Civil War the Forty-eighters' schemes of building a separate German state and of using America as a center of world revolution were gradually abandoned, but they were replaced with socialist and anarchist ambitions which Americans considered to be equally as dangerous. Most of the charter members of the original sections of the "International,"

---

[1] BHMM, Feb. 1888, p. 29. Cf. ibid., April 1887, p. 88; ibid., Dec. 1890, p. 355; ABHMS An. Rep., 1886, p. 34; ibid., 1888, p. 18.

[2] Wittke, op. cit., pp. 237-40; Faust, op. cit., I, 191-3.

founded in the United States in 1868, were German. It was a German Socialist who first proposed the formation of an independent political labor party out of the National Labor Union. His plan was first carried into effect by an American, but after the National Labor Party was formed, the German editor of the Arbeiter Union, an organ of the German trade unions of New York city, became one of its most influential exponents. Furthermore, the Socialist Labor Party of North America, organized in 1877 and for twenty years the dominant force in the American Socialist movement, drew most of its membership from among German-Americans; two of its three official papers were German, and for fifteen years German was used at its Conventions.[1]

Similarly, many Germans became involved in the anarchist movement of the 1870's and 1880's. Eight of the ten persons indicted in connection with the Haymarket Riot in 1886 were of German stock, a fact which was indelibly stamped on the reputation of German-Americans.

The extent to which Germans actually endangered the national security, however, was easily overestimated. The vast majority of Germans in America were as strongly opposed to radicalism as native Americans, and those who supported questionable enterprises had limited influence. German labor unions, for instance, had little effect upon English-speaking workers, and neither the German socialists nor the anarchists exerted much influence on national politics. Because it was so widely distributed throughout the country, the Socialist Labor Party never gained a single

---

[1]Faust, op. cit., I, 192-4; Wittke, op. cit., 240-2.

XUM

representative in Congress; and because of the swift and firm reaction to the Haymarket Affair, the anarchist movement was virtually crushed. Whether justified or not, however, American nativists, including many American Baptists, held German-Americans responsible for the Haymarket Riot and tended to greatly exaggerate their danger to the broader economic and political life of the country.[1]

Viewing the aggregate of these various un-American activities, therefore, American Baptists greatly feared for the future of the nation's social order as a whole. Even before the resurgence of a more overt nativism in the 1880's, there seems to have been widespread agreement among them that "the question of Home Missions is not alone one of the evangelization and salvation of the people of our country, but it is one of the perpetuity of our institutions, and the endurance of American civilization."[2] This was strongly reinforced and augmented when a massive new wave of immigration began to pour through the ports of entry during the early 1880's. After several years of relative confidance in the country's capacity to assimilate the newcomers, American Baptists again began to seriously question that assumption.[3] And should the nation fail in this regard, they envisioned the worst possible consequences. The immigrants, they presumed, would foreignize the native stock, Americans institutions would be degraded, and her destiny would

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1886, pp. 30-1; BHMM, Nov. 1885, p. 284; ibid., Sept. 1886, p. 212; ibid., Sept. 1892, p. 302.

[2] BHMM, Dec., 1879, p. 279.

[3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1880, p. 24; ibid., 1881, pp. 22-3; ibid., 1882, p. 119; ibid., 1886, p. 34; ibid., 1890, p. 10; BHMM, May 1893, p. 118.

XUM

be lost. Noticing the pervasive influence of German-Americans, in particular, the ABHMS committee on missions to the foreign population concluded, "We can save our people, our institutions and our German fellow citizens only by increased vigilance and renewed consecration of heart and purse to the work of giving the Gospel and Jesus Christ to this powerful people."[1]

Determined to prevent such a catastrophy, to safeguard America's civil and religious institutions, and to assure the fulfilment of its manifest destiny, American Baptists expressly aimed to Americanize the immigrants besides evangelizing them. That much is abundantly clear. They were now making no secret about their intentions, for in their judgment saving the republic and assuring God's providential destiny for the nation was not only a patriotic duty but a "high and holy motive."[2]

To assess the relative intensity of their solicitude for the spiritual welfare of the immigrants over against their anxiety to Americanize these newcomers is more difficult. Until the end of this period, there was still almost unanimous agreement that evangelization was the only effective means of Americanization.[3] No force, they held, is equal to the gigantic task of saving the nation from sinking under

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1883, p. 13. See also NYBUME An. Rep., 1886, p. 22.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1888, p. 12. See also ibid., p. 20; ibid., 1865 p. 37; ibid., 1886, p. 30; ibid., 1887, p. 15; BHMM, Dec. 1879, p. 279.

[3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1876, p. 21; ibid., 1888, p. 20; BHMM, Dec. 1879, p. 279; ibid., April 1887, p. 88; ibid., Feb. 1888, p. 29; ibid. Sept. 1889, p. 248; ibid., Sept. 1891, pp. 250-1; NYBYME An. Rep., 1884, p. 84; Davis, op. cit., p. 67; ABHMS, Baptist Home Missions, p. 469.

XUM

> this modern migration of peoples save the force of Christianity. The Gospel of Christ and the educational influences that spring out of that gospel make a morally and politically homogeneous people. Christianity makes good citizens, and Christianity alone is the safe guard of Republics.[1]

More than that, it was thought that evangelization would automatically result in Americanization.[2] The latter was an inevitable consequence of the former. Therefore, even when evangelization was given as the motive for missions among the immigrants, the stronger incentive may have been to gain the ultimate end of evangelization, namely Americanization, rather than to secure the salvation of souls.

Secondly, one can not expect the American Baptists to have admitted that they were more concerned about the welfare of the nation that about the souls of men, even if it had been true. A few denominational leaders ventured to suggest that the immigrants should be taught English before being evangelized,[3] probably only a minority of the leadership dared to expose such sentiments. Therefore, one can not simply accept their statements at face value.

In fact, there is good reason to question the stated position of the ABHMS, for instance. It proclaimed that the salvation of the foreign-speaking population is the paramount thing for Christian people to consider and that "the question of their Americanization is a minor matter which may safely be left to solve itself under the application of Gospel

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1886, p. 30.

[2] Ibid., 1882, p. 23; ibid., 1882, p. 47; Davis, op. cit., p. 83.

[3] The Examiner, May 1882, p. 5; ibid., May 25, 1882, p. 4; ibid., June 22, 1882, p. 5.

XUM

truth and their American environment."[1] At least part of the reason for making this statement, however, was to placate the immigrants who were infuriated at the very implication that some valued the safety of their country above human souls. And secondly, all of the society's literature manifestly reveals the opposite motives. When contributors to that literature urged home missions among Anglo-Americans, they cited as reasons such things as the Great Commission. When they urged work among the immigrants, on the other hand, they rarely pleaded for the welfare of the souls involved and instead consistently employed the line of reasoning delineated in this chapter.[2] This fact speaks for itself. In any event, Americanization obviously had remained a powerful motivational factor in their mission to the German-Americans.

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1889, p. 50.

[2] Almost any promotion of home missions among the immigrants will bear this out.

CHAPTER 5

GROWTH THROUGH COOPERATION

The modus operandi of the mission also remained basically unchanged. Some significant modifications of it were adopted, but the basic approach initiated during the formative years of the mission was maintained. Both to Christianize and to Americanize the immigrants--given the American Baptist conception of the relationship between evangelization and Americanization--it was necessary to train ministers who could conduct the work, to promote missionary activity, to organize congregations, and to erect places of worship.

American Baptist financial support of the mission, on the other hand, was significantly increased. In fact, the role that American Baptists were to play in the mission became primarily that of a subsidizing agency. As the German Baptists churches multipled in numbers and were more broadly scattered throughout the country, American Baptist churches had less occasion to evangelize German-Americans directly or to serve as seed-plots for German churches.[1] German Baptists provided the laborers, but American Baptists supplied the larger portion of the funds.

As a donor to the mission, the ABHMS now clearly assumed the lead. Whereas it had employed only an average of four German missionaries annu-

---

[1]Although such cases still occurred as in Attica and Folsomdale, New York; Indianapolis; New Brunswick, New Jersey; and Topeka, Kansas.

ally from 1850 to 1863, from 1864 to 1869 it increased that number to fifteen.[1] Most of the newly organized German churches were served by missionaries commissioned by the Society.[2]

Of course the German churches were also expected to contribute to the cause, which they did. Beginning to feel that the mission to their countrymen demanded greater effort and better organization on their part,[3] the two German conferences which had been organized financed and administered the visitation of some of their pastors to prospective church sites and pastorless churches unreached by the missionary pastors employed by the ABHMS. Observing that under this arrangement other denominations sometimes reaped where they had sown,[4] they went yet another step. In 1867 the Eastern Conference and one year later the Western Conference further began supporting pastors who settled in locations that offered favorable prospects for gathering a congregation,[5] the approach used by the ABHMS.

Neither the German conferences nor the ABHMS, however, was satisfied with the other's performance. In view of the vast increase in the ABHMS's budget following the Civil War, the German churches contended

---

[1]And at least until 1866 it expressed its willingness to expand this branch of its work even further (ABHMS An. Rep., 1866, p. 19).

[2]Ibid., 1868, p. 38.

[3]Verh. (W), 1859, p. 4; DS, Nov. 2, 1898, p. 691.

[4]Verh. (E), 1868, p. 19.

[5]Ibid., 1867, p. 9; Verh. (W), 1869, pp. 6, 9.

that their work should receive a larger slice of the pie.[1] Even though the number of German missionaries employed by the Society was almost doubled between 1865 and 1867, they still felt that American Baptists lacked interest in the mission.[2] When therefore the ABHMS failed to increase that number and in fact cut it back by one-third in 1869, the Germans loudly protested the Society's neglect of "the most important mission demanded of Americans."[3] It seemed unjust to them that the four to five million Germans in America, who constituted nearly one-half of the immigrant population or about one-eighth of the total population (their figures) and exercised as much influence as an equal number of native-born Americans, received only about one-twentieth of the ABHMS funds.[4] The Society, in turn, felt that the German churches were negligent in their own contributions to home missions and expected them, on the one hand, to do more to support themselves and, on the other, to begin contributing to the society which was keeping them alive.[5]

There was some basis for both complaints. In proportion to their numbers, the ABHMS had appropriated far less to the work among the German-Americans than to that among the frontiersmen or the freedmen. In 1869, for instance, over one-third of the Society's missionaries were

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1865, p. 31. [2] Verh. (W), 1867, pp. 5-6.

[3] DS, June 2, 1869, p. 86. They often used American nativistic arguments about the German threat to promote work among their countrymen.

[4] Ibid.; ibid., Oct. 7, 1868, p. 154; ibid., Nov. 4, 1868, p. 166; ibid., Sept. 29, 1869, p. 16.

[5] Verh. (E), 1869, p. 11; DS, Oct 18, 1871, p. 158; ibid., Oct. 25, 1871, p. 162.

XUM

employed among the freedmen, though these people constituted only one-eighth of the population. Hence, the German Baptist complaint about American Baptist lack of interest in the German mission and failure to perceive its importance. But probably even more disconcerting was the precariousness of American Baptist support. When the Home Mission Society cut back on the number of German missionaries in its employment, several prospective congregations, which had already cost much effort, had to be abandoned.[1] With the American Baptist Publication Society's termination of all its German employees still vivid in their memory, the German Baptists must have wondered at times what would happen if the ABHMS were to do the same. Being unable to support themselves, many German churches would have had to be abandoned and the entire German work would have been placed in jeopardy. Its future existence still largely depended on the whim of the American Baptists. When support from that source fluctuated, and particularly when it dropped, therefore, the German churches were naturally on edge.

On the other hand, the German churches had been negligent too. Having their own home mission societies to support, they had contributed virtually nothing to the ABHMS,[2] to which most of them after all owed their existence. And when they faced the facts squarely and honestly, they had to admit that they had not done all they could for their own home mission projects either.[3] They had relied too heavily upon American Baptist aid and had not sufficiently grasped the significance of their

---

[1] Verh. (E), 1868, pp. 19-20. [2] Ibid., 1870, p. 6.

[3] Ibid., 1867, p. 9.

own home mission responsibilities[1]--many of their church members apparently not even being aware of the existence of the German Baptist home mission societies.[2] Being relatively poor congregations, they all too readily passed the buck to their "rich" American brethren.[3] Even the individual who had complained most bitterly about the ABHMS's failure to do its utmost,[4] came to see that the German churches had expected too much from the American Baptists and needed to become more self-supporting.[5] Nor did the Germans always have capable and worthy men for the Home Mission Society to employ.[6]

In an attempt to improve this relationship, the Eastern Conference of the German churches arranged a plan of cooperation with the ABHMS in 1870.[7] Rather than the two conducting home missions independent of each other and partly duplicating each other's efforts, they decided on a cooperative plan (for that part of the work done within the boundaries of the Eastern Conference) whereby the mission society of the conference surveyed the needs of the field, recommended the fields and missionaries most in need of support, fostered a missionary spirit in the German churches, and collected their home mission contributions. These funds were then send to the ABHMS, which in turn commissioned the missionaries

---

[1] DS, Jan. 20, 1869, p. 10. This was probably more true of the Eastern Conference than of the Western.

[2] Verh. (E), 1868, p. 20. [3] DS, Oct. 18, 1871, p. 158.

[4] Ibid., June 2, 1869, p. 86. [5] Ibid., Oct. 25, 1871, p. 162.

[6] Ibid., July 25, 1866, p. 114; Verh. (E), 1866, p. 6; DS, Jan. 13, 1869, p. 6.

[7] Verh. (E), 1870, p. 5.

XUM

recommended by the German society and paid their salaries, supplementing the contributions of the German churches as was necessary.[1] In addition, a German mission secretary was appointed to administer the operation; to serve as a laison between the two societies; to help keep American Baptist churches, associations, and conventions informed and interested in the German mission; and to do some itinerant work.[2]

The Western Conference moved more slowing and cautiously. Fearing the loss of some of its independence and autonomy by allowing the ABHMS to administer the financial end of the German work in its territory,[3] it decided instead to promote the mission among American Baptist churches itself and to solicit their contributions directly.[4] Encouraged by good reports from the Eastern Conference and having been assured by the corresponding secretary of the Home Mission Society, Rev. Jay S. Backus, that it would gain in influence and support among American Baptists without losing any autonomy by closer financial ties with his society, the Conference again discussed the issue at length at its 1871 session, but refused to go further than to appoint an itinerant minister to be in charge of some of the administrative responsibilities of its home mission society.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., 1871, p. 30; DS, April 13, 1870, p. 58.

[2] Verh. (E), 1870, p. 6; DS, loc. cit.

[3] Verh. (W), 1870, p. 10.

[4] But it went on record as recognizing the importance of, at least, reporting its income to the ABHMS and as requesting that the Society acknowledge these receipts in its paper, without in fact receiving the funds (ibid., 1869, p. 9).

[5] Ibid., 1871, pp. 4-6.

When, however, immediately following the 1871 conference, Secretary Backus assured the mission committee of the Conference that his society would not only pay the salary of the newly appointed itinerant minister but would attempt to secure two dollars from his society for every one raised by the Conference for home missions, the committee appears to have been persuaded.[1] And at the 1872 conference session, it managed to secure the approval of the entire Conference for a plan of cooperation essentially the same as that entered into two years earlier by the Eastern Conference, exception for the additional guarantee of a triple return on each dollar raised in the German churches.[2]

The results were beyond the expectations of both the German conferences and the Home Mission Society. Forced to take their home mission responsibilities more seriously by the fact that the ABHMS's contribution was now directly proportionate to their own, the German churches rapidly enlarged their giving. In the first full year under the plan of cooperation, the Eastern Conference gave more than three times the amount it had contributed the year before and almost as much as during all the previous years.[3] The increase for the Western Conference was less dramatic because its churches were already giving more nearly to the extent of their ability before entering upon the plan.[4] By 1874 the German churches

---

[1] DS, Oct. 18, 1871, p. 158.

[2] Ibid., Feb. 21, 1872, p. 30; Verh. (W), 1870, p. 12.

[3] BHMM, Feb. 1897, p. 58; Die Deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nordamerika. Verhandlungen der Jahres-Konferenzen (Cleveland, 1926), pp. 178-9.

[4] DS, May 16, 1894, p. 6.

XUM

were giving more per capita for home missions than the American Baptists and still continued to improve upon that record thereafter.[1]

The Home Mission Society was naturally pleased, but soon found itself unable to fulfil its terms of the agreement. Although agreeing that the German mission was worthy of more support,[2] it was forced to make cutbacks, because of the depression of 1873-1878 and a growing debt. Consequently, in late 1873 it informed the German conferences that it would only double their contributions rather than tripling them as in the past.[3] Moreover, it instructed the conferences to exercise great caution and thrift in making recommendations for missionary appointments, requesting aid only where it was absolutely necessary and only for the most promising fields.[4] Finding the Germans still too aggressive, it made further cutbacks; screened their applications for aid more closely, refusing some applicants and reducing the support of others; and insisted that the number of German missionaries appointed must be limited by the Society's ability to support them, obligating the Germans to assume full support of any additional ones not approved by itself.[5]

At first the cutbacks created some misunderstanding among the churches seeking aid and the missionaries who had previously received

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1874, p. 22. See also Verh. (W), 1877, p. 5.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1874, p. 22. [3] DS, Jan. 7, 1874, p. 3.

[4] Verh. (W), 1874, p. 15.

[5] Verh. (E), 1876, pp. 10-1, 17; DS, May 2, 1877, p. 140; Verh. (W), 1877, p. 11; Verh. (E), 1877, p. 10; DS, April 24, 1878, p. 132; ibid., July 10, 1878, p. 212; ibid., July 31, 1878, p. 236.

XUM

support. There was some consolation in the fact that the Home Mission Society continued its cooperation with the German conferences even though similar plans with several American Baptist state conventions were terminated in 1874.[1] A special meeting of the board of the Society with representatives of the German conferences, called in the fall of 1876 to clarify the issues involved, also helped the latter to see that most members of the board had a genuine interest in the German mission but were severely hamstrung financially.[2] But when the Society again began denying some of the German Baptist requests for support and cutting the salaries of other missionaries, the Germans became greatly agitated over what appeared as a presumption on the part of the Society to know the needs of their fields and to determine the mission churches' ability to support themselves better than the Germans themselves and an infringement upon the conferences' prerogative to evaluate these needs and to make recommendations.[3]

By 1878 many of the Germans were seriously questioning the advisability of continuing the plans of cooperation, believing that they could solicit more from the American Baptist churches directly than they were receiving through the Home Mission Society.[4] But the majority continued to favor cooperation, and soon there were some indications of increased

---

[1] Verh. (E), 1875, p. 8; Verh. (W), 1875, p. 13.

[2] DS, July 10, 1878, p. 212; ABHMS An. Rep., 1876, p. 21; Verh. (W), 1877, p. 11.

[3] DS, April 24, 1878, p. 132; ibid., July 10, 1878, p. 212; Verh. (W), 1878, p. 18.

[4] DS, July 10, 1878, p. 212; ibid., July 24, 1878, p. 229; ibid., July 31, 1878, p. 236.

aid from the Society in the future.[1] In 1879 it did in fact approve recommendations for support much more readily,[2] and in 1880 it agreed to supplement each home mission dollar raised in the Western Conference with a dollar and a half, because of the massive German immigration into that region.[3] In June of 1884 it also conceded to the same benefits for the Eastern Conference.[4] But it had no sooner made this arrangement when it suffered another sudden financial setback and for a third time had to impose cutbacks on the German mission and had to reduce its supplement of German contributions to a one to one ratio, in addition to which it set a ceiling beyond which it would not double the German gifts.[5] As it recovered from these financial reverses, however, it gradually raised the ceiling of $6,500 set in 1884 to $8,000 in 1890,[6] so that it employed an average of fifty-five German missionaries annually from 1879 to 1892, as compared to only thirty-two from 1870 to 1878, and paid out more for their salaries in the nine years from 1882 to 1891 than during the entire period from 1846 to 1882.[7]

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1878, p. 24; DS, July 31, 1878, p. 237; Verh. (E), 1878, p. 11.

[2] Verh. (E), 1879, p. 11.

[3] Ibid., 1880, p. 9; DS, June 8, 1881, p. 181.

[4] Verh. (JK), 1884, p. viii.

[5] DS, May 27, 1885, p. 172; Verh. (E), 1885, p. iv; Die Deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nord Amerika. Verhandlungen der Bundes-Konferenz (Cleveland, 1886), p. 14.

[6] Verh. (JK), 1887, App. V; ABHMS An. Rep., 1889, p. 52; DS, May 21, 1890, p. 4.

[7] BHMM, Nov. 1891, p. 328.

XUM

In addition, during the early 1880's the Church Edifice Department of the Home Mission Society began to give occasional grants and loans to young German Baptist congregations to assist them in erecting places of worship. Since the demand for aid still far exceeded the supply, the General Mission Committee of the General Conference[1] moved to start a separate church edifice fund in 1887.[2] Ever since 1881 the German conferences had hoped to arrange a plan of cooperation with the Church Edifice Department of the Society comparable to the one they had with the Missionary Department.[3] When in 1889 the Home Mission Society conceded to such a plan, promising to match contributions from the German churches,[4] and the following year increased this amount to two dollars for every dollar given by the Germans,[5] the results again were significiant. Whereas the Society only paid out $3,000 for church edifice construction among German Baptists in the twelve years from 1880 to 1891, from 1890 to 1892 alone the figure amounted to $10,975.[6]

Inasmuch as the Home Mission Society aimed to evangelize German-Americans, its expenditures for the mission proved to be a good investment. Although the German Baptists always contended that the importance of their work called for much more assistance than the Society was appropriating

---

[1]All the conference mission committees united under one General Missionary Secretary and mission committee in 1883.

[2]Verh. (JK), 1887, App. VII. [3]Ibid., 1881, p. 52.

[4]DS, May 15, 1889, p. 4; Verh. (Gen.), 1889, p. 94.

[5]DS, May 21, 1890, p. 4; Verh. (JK), 1891, p. iv.

[6]BHMM, Nov. 1891, p. 304; Verh. (Gen.), 1892, App. IV, p. v.

for it[1] and complained about the cutbacks during the mid-1880's,[2] they were generally pleased with the gradually increasing assistance they received[3] and used it efficiently. In 1885, for instance, the ratio of baptisms to membership in the German churches of several states was at least two and one half times as large as that among the American Baptists,[4] and in the three decades from 1863 to 1893 the total membership of the German churches increased almost six-fold, from 3,134 to 18,565.[5]

Thus, by 1893 the ABHMS's relationship to the German conferences had clearly distinguished itself as the most significant tie between the American Baptists and their German mission. Knowing that the amount of aid they would receive from the Society would be directly proportionate to their own contributions, the German churches were inspired to more sacrificial giving.[6] At the same time, adhering to the principle of helping those who help themselves and of investing its funds where they reap the most returns,[7] the Home Mission Society tried harder to assist the Germans in return. Being more directly affected by the internal affairs of the American Baptists, the German Baptists also took a greater interest in the larger denomination. And from closer association with

---

[1] DS, May 12, 1880, p. 156; BHMM, Nov. 1882, p. 298.

[2] Verh. (E), 1885, pp. 20, iv.

[3] Verh. (Gen.), 1886, p. 18; ibid., 1889, p. 98.

[4] NYBUME An. Rep., 1885, p. 24. [5] DS, Jan. 7, 1903, p. 5.

[6] ABHMS An. Rep., 1875, pp. 32-3.

[7] ABHMS An. Rep., 1869, p. 17; ibid., 1882, pp. 40-1, 59-60; ABHMS, Baptist Home Missions, p. 117.

its German mission--through reports concerning it, and through representatives from the mission at its meetings and on its committees--the Home Mission Society became better informed and more concerned about this branch of its larger enterprise.

In the meantime, the Woman's Baptist Home Mission Society (WBHMS) also entered the field. The purpose and approach of this society is concisely stated in the commission given to its lady missionaries:

> Your work shall have special reference to the elevation and christianization of the homes of the people. This you shall seek to accomplish by visitation from house to house, reading and exposition of God's word and prayer, instruction in domestic duties, care of the family and of the sick, gathering all classes into Sunday schools and religious meetings, and the women and children into industrial schools, organizing temperance societies, and in all practicable ways seeking to lift up and purify the lives and save the souls of those to whom you are sent.[1]

Although it did some work among the freedmen, Indians, and the new settlements of the West, it devoted much of its effort to the "heathen immigrants," maintaining:

> the masses of these incoming multitudes are blinded by Jesuitism, or intrenched in infidelity, and the usual means of grace furnished by Christian churches fail to win them to the worship of God. With occasional exceptions they avoid our houses of worship. If the foreign population are ever won to embrace the Gospel, it must first be taken to them in their homes.[2]

Consequently, this society also became involved in the German mission. Unlike the ABHMS, the WBHMS had to train its own missionaries before commissioning them, since the denominational seminaries were not yet co-educational. The school it founded for this purpose was not opened till the fall of 1881, but by the next summer the first two German

---

[1] BHMM, Nov. 1884, p. 281. [2] Ibid.

XUM

missionaries had already completed the short course of studies and were placed in fields of service.[1] Thereafter, their number gradually rose to about 15 by 1893, and the Society was considering the possibility of appointing a German assistant to its corresponding secretary.[2]

Women in the German churches were urged to organize more local women's missionary societies, to develop some central organization, and to contribute to the cause of the English-speaking society.[3] Many new societies were founded and in the decade of 1883-1893 they raised $5,829 for home mission purposes, most of which was donated to the WBHMS,[4] but the greater cost of that society's German missionaries had to be born by the Society itself.

The American Baptist Publication Society's contribution to the mission during this period was relatively small but not entirely insignificant. In all fairness to the Society, it must be noted that, in an effort to cut the cost of publishing the German literature needed by their churches, both the Eastern and the Western Conferences founded their own printing and tract societies in 1863[5] and in 1865 organized a joint publishing society, which in one year had published more German tracts than were available from the English society. Therefore, when

---

[1] Ibid., May, 1882, p. 136.

[2] DS, Nov. 26, 1884, p. 372; ibid., Jan. 12, 1887, p. 2; ibid., Aug. 6, 1890, p. 2; ibid., May 11, 1892, p. 3; Verh. (Gen.), 1892, p. 128.

[3] E.g., DS, Aug. 17, 1881, p. 252.

[4] Ibid., Aug., 23, 1882, p. 260; Verh. (Gen.), 1898, App. VIII.

[5] Verh. (W), 1863, pp. 21-2; Verh. (E), 1863, p. 13; DS, Dec. 1863, p. 22.

for some reason the American Baptist society again took an interest in the German work, publishing a number of new tracts and other writing, offering to publish some German books, electing a German Baptist pastor to its board, and proposing some kind of cooperative relationship with the German society, the German Baptists were grateful but hesitant, fearful of an infringement upon their autonomy, distrustful of the service they would receive, and persuaded that with their own society to support, they would be unable to contribute to the English society, as they expected would be requested.[1] But eventually a compact was agreed upon in 1872, in which the English society pledged itself, so far as its ability would warrant, to publish all works selected and recommended by the German Baptist Publication Society and to appoint one or more German Baptists to its Board of Managers annually, asking the German society only to select desirable German works for publication, to help circulate them in the German churches, and to submit reports of its receipts and general operations.[2]

Several publications appeared under this arrangement in the following two years, but because of the English society's continued impatience to Americanize the Germans and the inability of some of its board members to see the need for an expanded effort at publishing German materials,[3] cooperation and communication between the two societies tapered off so sharply that by 1880 even the editor of the German publications was unclear

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1868, p. 7; ibid., 1871, pp. 56, 63; Verh. (E), 1870, p. 15; ibid., 1871, p. 34, Verh. (W), 1870, p. 7; DS, March 8, 1871, p. 38.

[2] ABPS An. Rep., 1874, pp. 17-8; DS, Nov. 13, 1872, p. 178.

[3] Verh. (E), 1873, p. 18; DS, Oct. 28, 1874, p. 162; ibid., Sept. 1, 1875, p. 265.

XUM

about the original terms of cooperation.[1] But the entire affair may be significant as another early indication that, unless compelled by financial reasons, the German Baptists defended their autonomy even at the cost of monitary losses.

Additional financial aid from local American Baptist churches, associations, and state conventions was sporadic and is difficult to trace but was nevertheless significant. Before the Church Edifice Department of the ABHMS agreed to a plan of cooperation with the German conferences, German congregations involved in building projects were constantly forced to seek assistance from other American Baptist sources. In many instances they received from one to five thousand dollars and in one exceptional case fifteen thousand,[2] which in itself amounted to more than the Church Edifice Department had allocated to German congregations in both grants and loans by 1893.

The Germans were also to receive some aid in supporting their pastors. The Home Mission Society had largely preempted the support of German missionaries--as well as those of other nationalities--until the recession of the 1870's.[3] But when it became unable to meet the demand, the German churches increasingly looked to some of the older and better established state conventions and associations for additional assistance and received a growing amount from them, totalling a few thousand dollars

---

[1] DS, May 12, 1880, p. 156.

[2] DS, May 2, 1866, pp. 70-1.

[3] E.g., DS, Dec. 2, 1874, p. 182; ABHMS An. Rep., 1882, p. 47.

annually by 1893.[1]

In addition to assisting in the support of German missionaries, in the building of church edifices for German congregations, and in publishing German literature, American Baptists continued to provide the larger share of the funds necessary for the German Department of Rochester Theological Seminary. Because of over-dependence upon their American brethren, indifference and opposition to formal ministerial education in some of their churches, and limited financial resources, during most of the 1860's German Baptists still contributed only a small fraction of what it cost to operate their seminary. Toward the end of that decade, however, the amount was significantly increased. The more generous employment measures of the ABHMS and the consequent need for more pastors, apparently contributed to the change of mind.[2] In the meantime, August Rauschenbusch and others had also successfully defended and promoted the seminary, so that by 1870 it had the approval and moral support of nearly all of the German churches.[3] As a result, their financial support increased as well, averaging around 2,000 to 2,200 dollars a year from 1870 to 1893. That amount still went a long way in those days but was not nearly enough to cover the expenses of the Department.

Although the greater part of the funds raised by the German churches was allocated for beneficiaries for their students, American

---

[1]The Eastern Conference alone received $1,650 in 1893 (Verh. (E), 1893, pp. 33-4).

[2]Verh. (W), 1867, p. 4.

[3]DS, Feb. 5, 1868, p. 18. NYBUME, An. Rep., 1870, p. 26.

Baptists still had to defray more than half of that expense. They regularly paid one half of the amount from 1874 to 1893.[1] Because the German churches had not contributed much prior to that period, American Baptists probably paid even a larger percentage of the cost then. In all likelihood, therefore, they raised about $40,000 of the $73,712 total paid out in beneficiaries by 1893.[2]

Another expense was professors' salaries. In 1868 the $20,000 endowment for the German Department, which was begun in 1854, was finally completed.[3] The interest from it seems to have covered most of Rauschenbusch's salary, and the German churches assumed most of the wages for assistants employed between the years 1867 and 1872.[4] But upon repeated requests from the General Conference of the German churches,[5] the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education appointed Rev. Hermann Schäffer as a second professor in 1872, thus adding to the costs.[6] During the first two years of his employment, the German churches paid about half of his salary, but thereafter the Union assumed all of that as well.[7] A third professor was appointed in 1884,[8] and when August

---

[1] DS, Oct. 10, 1877, p. 317; ibid., June 18, 1902, p. 387.

[2] NYBUME An. Rep., 1900, p. 22. [3] Ibid., 1868, p. 25.

[4] DS, Oct. 23, 1867, p. 163; NYBUME An. Rep., 1868, p. 14; DS, Dec. 21, 1870, p. 194; NYBUME An. Rep., 1871, p. 25; ibid., 1872, p. 27.

[5] Verh. (Gen.), 1868, p. 9; ibid., 1871, p. 65.

[6] NYBUME An. Rep., 1872, p. 20. [7] Verh. (E), 1873, pp. 6-7.

[8] Because the pre-theological course of the Department was expanded into a regular academy in 1879, the total program was extended, the standard was raised, and the student body increased.

Rauschenbusch retired and a further year was added to the program, he was replaced by two men in 1890, making a total of four professors in the German Department.[1] Consequently, even though the endowment had been increased somewhat in the meantime, by 1893 the professors' salaries alone were costing about $3,400 a year more than the income from the endowment.[2]

When the German Department purchased a dormitory for its students in 1874, it was given permission to solicit funds in American Baptist churches, with the consequence that about two-thirds of the $20,000 needed was received from this source. And again, when this building was replaced by a new one in 1890, $28,675 of the total cost of $42,138 came from American Baptists.[3] None of these funds were contributed by the New York Baptist Union, but they may have cut into financial resources from which the Union may otherwise have been able to draw.

In view of the rising cost of maintaining the German Department, the Union concluded in 1883 that it could no longer bear the whole burden alone. Since most of the German students came from states other than New York and returned to work in them, the Union felt that those states should share in the expense of the Department[4] and for several years made

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1883, App. I, p. iv; DS, Nov, 14, 1883, p. 356; ibid., June 4, 1884, p. 180.

[2] NYBUME An. Rep., 1893, p. 24.

[3] Verh. (Gen.), 1892, App. III, p. ii. But particularly from J. D. Rockefeller, A. N. Perrin, and A. Moseley (NYBUME An. Rep., 1891, pp. 35-6.

[4] NYBUME An. Rep., 1883, p. 18.

considerable effort to gain their assistance.[1] When in 1890 still only a very limited number had come to its aid, it was suffering from a mounting debt, the cost of operating the Department had risen to $7,500 a year,[2] and the student body was expected to increase even further, the Union urged the German churches to affiliate themselves with the American Baptist state conventions and to promote their department in those circles. It also considered making the Germans responsible for soliciting the needed funds from the various American Baptist state educational societies.[3] Apparently, the Germans dissuaded it from taking the latter step.[4] But when two years later other states were still slow to help and the Union was accruing an annual deficit of $5,000, it was compelled to terminate its financial aid to German students, obligating the German churches to assume the full cost of the beneficiaries.[5]

Till 1893, however, American Baptists had born by far the largest share of the expenses of the Department. Without this aid the German churches could not have sustained their school and certainly could not have enlarged the faculty and facilities as was done.

While the modus operandi adopted for the mission to German-Americans remained essentially the same, therefore, American Baptists not only sustained their motivation for the mission but also considerably enlarged their financial support of it and arranged much closer coopera-

---

[1] Ibid., 1885, p. 21; ibid., 1886, p. 22. [2] Ibid., 1890, p. 20,

[3] Ibid., pp. 20-1. [4] Verh. (E), 1890, p. 16.

[5] NYBUME An. Rep., 1893. p. 23.

tion with the German Baptists, resulting in encouraging expansion of the work.

CHAPTER 6

THE GERMAN BAPTISTS ALSO BECOME AMERICANS

Making Christians and Baptists of the German-Americans also had some of the Americanizing side-effects which American Baptists desired. In some respects the results may even have been better than American Baptists had anticipated. But as far as the institutional assimilation of the German Baptists was concerned, much was left to be desired.

Nowhere was the process of Americanization more evident than in the German Baptists' ready acceptance of the prevailing American religious beliefs and practices (which, it will be recalled, were regarded as the foundation of the entire American social order). In fact, few immigrants from continental Europe, before or later, adapted as readily to American religion.

This was due partly to the minority status of German Baptists among their own countrymen both in Germany and America. Being viewed as an undesirable religious minority and as dangerous fanatics, they were rejected, suppressed and persecuted in Germany and denounced and harassed in America. They, in turn, naturally responded with bitter frustration and resentment. They had already cut themselves off from the core of German religious tradition by becoming Baptists, but persecution abroad and molestation here furthered their alienation. Furthermore, because of the fundamental and dramatic change they ascribed to a conscious experi-

ence of conversion, they thought of themselves as living in an entirely different spiritual kingdom than most of their countrymen. Insofar as Americanization required that the immigrants first divest themselves of their traditional religious ideas, therefore, German Baptists had already inadvertently crossed this first and most difficult hurdle.

They did identify with the Anabaptist and pietist element in their religious tradition. In fact, German Pietism served as a stepping-stone to the adoption of Baptist principles for many of them and remained one of the major formative influences upon the new denomination.[1] Because of the extensive similarities between the Evangelical Movement in Europe and the pietistic evangelicalism so characteristic of mid-nineteenth century American Protestantism,[2] however, they were all the better prepared to merge into the American religious scene.

As Baptists, though, they had no precedent in German religious tradition to draw upon. As a result, they made considerable use of the rich resources of American Baptist knowledge and experience,[3] and were extensively influenced by it.[4] Occasion was given for this type of absorption of American Baptist religion in cases where the latter's churches served as seed-plots for German churches and when representatives of

---

[1]Ohlmann, op. cit., pp. 15-26.

[2]Sidney E. Mead, The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), pp. 115, 127; Smith, op. cit., p. 59.

[3]DS, July 1858, p. 2.

[4]Ohlmann, loc. cit. See also Verh. (JK), 1926, pp. 174-5.

American Baptist churches participated in German Baptist conferences, in the organization of new German churches, in the ordination of German Baptist candidates for the ministry, and in church councils. It also occurred, conversely, through the German Baptists' extensive reading of American Baptist literature[1] and through their participation in American Baptist associations, state conventions, and national societies. But the most extensive imbibing of American Baptist influence undoubtedly occurred at the seminary. Until August Rauschenbusch came to the school, the German students received their theological instruction from American Baptist professors. And even after Rauschenbusch had arrived, some of them continued to take courses in the English Department, concurrent with their program in the German Department, and others continued their education in the American Baptist University of Rochester, in Rochester Theological Seminary, or in both, after completing the German course of studies. Even those who did all of their work under Rauschenbusch had daily contact with American students, because all of their classes were held in the same buildings until 1875 and at least some of them for several years longer.[2] And many of the friendships made between German and American pastors at the seminary, or later in their pastorates, were sustained over a period of many years.

Consequently, while the German Baptists as a conference did not adopt any of the American Baptist confessions of faith, they considered themselves to be in full agreement with their American brethren on the

---

[1]Much of which was translated and used in Der Sendbote.

[2]DS, Nov. 20, 1895, pp. 4-5.

fundamentals of the faith. Speaking of the American Baptists, the editor of Der Sendbote in 1858 said, "Their rudiments are exactly like ours, and in addition they possess, as a whole, a rich, rich treasure of knowledge and experience." Indeed, "it would be a shameful arrogance, if we were to scorn this treasure rather than to use it."[1] That kind of appreciation for and receptivity to American Baptist theology prevailed throughout this period, so that at the end of it Dr. H. L. Morehouse of the ABHMS could justifiably praise the German Baptists for their orthodoxy.[2]

The German churches were even more reliant on American Baptists for church polity. Because German Pietism was of less help to them at this point than in other areas of theology, they looked particularly to American Baptists for guidance and counsel. By 1862 Rauschenbusch was using Edward T. Hiscox's Baptist Church Directory[3] and Henry J. Ripley's Sacred Rhetoric[4] as textbooks for his courses in church administration and homiletics, respectively,[5] and in 1868 the General Conference approved of James M. Pendleton's Church Manual[6] as the standard handbook of church polity for its churches.[7] Within one year from the time of its publi-

---

[1]Ibid., July, 1858, p. 2.

[2]BHMM, Nov. 1891, pp. 301-2. See also DS, Feb. 27, 1884, p. 68.

[3]The Baptist Church Directory, A Guide to the Doctrines and Practices of Baptist Churches (New York: Sheldon & Company, 1859).

[4](Boston: Gould, Kendally & Lincoln, 1849).

[5]DS, July 1862, p. 2.

[6]Church Manual, Designed for the Use of Baptist Churches (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1867.

[7]Verh. (Gen.), 1868, p. 6.

cation, eight hundred copies had been sold, or in other words, enough to provide each German congregation with several copies.[1]

As members of a new denomination in its inexperienced and impressible years, German Baptists were undoubtedly also more receptive to the entire climate of American religion which surrounded them than were immigrants who arrived with a firmly established religious tradition.

Inasmuch as personal holiness, separation from the "world," and rigid church discipline characterized mid-nineteenth century American Protestantism, the German Baptists not only were clearly in full agreement with American ideals but may even have excelled most American Protestants at them. As early as 1858, they themselves claimed an edge on the older and larger American Baptist congregations in their aspiration for the inner, hidden life with Christ; in their avoidance of worldliness, pride, and fadish (Modesucht), with all the evils related to it; in their opposition to fraternizing with the worldly, namely in secret societies and in marriages with unbelievers; and in their abhorrence of slavery.[2]

Impelled by a heavy and consistent emphasis on nurturing the Christian life through Bible study and prayer,[3] they may in fact have surpassed American Baptists in the practice of piety, if the latter can be measured by such things as better public participation in prayer meetings.[4] In any case, they carried the ideas of separation from worldly pursuits and pleasures and rigid church discipline further than many American

---

[1] Ibid., 1871, p. 54. [2] DS, July 1858, p. 2.

[3] Ohlmann, op. cit., pp. 60-4. [4] DS, Jan. 2, 1889, p. 2.

Baptists. Viewing the whole world as a vast organism of sin, they not only objected to theatres, dancing, and gambling[1] but also to the adornment of women, operas, levity, fiction, and circuses.[2] And to keep their churches free from impurities, they dutifully reproved erring members and liberally excluded those who did not submit themselves to correction, including the quarrelsome, the disobedient, and those married to unbelievers.[3] In comparison to the common practice in American Baptist churches, these were harsh measures.[4] In fact, in the mature judgment of two seasoned German Baptists it was "the rigorous discipline maintained in their churches and the firm attitude against all worldly pleasures that caused some hesitancy on the part of the German churches to fellowship with Baptist churches in general."[5] In 1866 the Western Conference even resolved to protest the American Baptists' toleration of secret societies.[6]

In regard to the pseudo-religious practices of Sabbath observance and temperance, issues on which German-Americans had particularly met with American Baptist disfavor, German Baptists also showed signs of

---

[1]E.g., ibid., Dec. 1855, p. 2; Die Biene, Jan. 1865, p. 2; Verh. (E), 1867, p. 7; DS, Sept. 19, 1866, p. 141; ibid., April 21, 1880, pp. 132-3; ibid., Jan. 30, 1884, p. 36; ibid., April 29, 1885, p. 141.

[2]E.g., DS, Nov. 2, 1887, p. 3; ibid., June 30, 1875, p. 204; ibid., Sept. 1862, p. 10; Verh. (Gen.), 1874, p. 20; Verh. (W), 1870, p. 5.

[3]Verh. (E), 1854, p. 7; DS, March 25, 1868, p. 46.

[4]The Macedonian and Record, March 1870, p. 11; Verh. (E), 1876, p. 5; DS, May 21, 1879, p. 165; F. Wayland, The Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches, ed. by John H. Hinton (London: J. Heaton & Son, 1861), pp. 137-9.

[5]BHMM, Feb. 1897, p. 59. See also ibid., Jan. 1896, p. 31.

[6]Verh. (W), 1866, pp. 6-7.

XUM

significant Americanization. From the very outset, for instance, they adopted a view of the Sabbath which was much closer to that of the Puritans than that of the Continentals. Looking back upon this period from a later date, G. A. Schulte reported, "It was taken for granted, then, that members who were not sick or deterred by extraordinary hindrances would attend the services."[1] Parents were advised to gather the young people for a Bible study on Sunday, in order to keep the day holy and not permit it to become a day of playing, drinking, and sinning.[2] And at an early date the Eastern Conference urgently recommended that its congregations observe the Lord's day, entreating them to refrain from all worldly commerce, such as buying and selling, and instead to serve the Lord according to James 1:27, in order to avoid conflicts with or distractions from Sunday worship and rest.[3] Pastors in the Western Conference, similarly, advised against buying milk on Sunday, writing letters, and much cooking, which often kept women from the services.[4]

Lest some might forget these admonishments or renege on them, there were those who regularly kept them before the fellowship in subsequent years. With one accord they denounced the Continental Sunday and called for a day of rest, meditation, and prayer, a day in which everyone would strive to foster only the work of the Lord; win souls for him; attend worship; become quiet before God in prayer; and seek instruction and edification in the study of scripture, Christian fellowship,

---

[1]Schulte, op. cit., p. 18. [2]Die Biene, Jan. 1864, p. 4.

[3]Verh. (E), 1859, p. 7. [4]Verh. (W), 1862, p. 15.

and the reading of devotional literature.[1]

To assure that the day would be spent in this fashion, the influential August Rauschenbusch and others also compiled a growing list of things that ought not to be done. Chief among these was any unnecessary work. German Baptists quickly came to the support of Sunday Blue Laws, fearing that if some people were required to work, others would be forced to do the same. No exceptions were to be made, even if it meant that a church member might lose his job. Similarly, visiting and feasting were thought to require too much work of the women, and travelling on commercial transportation to wrongly obligate the operators to work. If someone needed to go anywhere on Sunday, he was advised to walk so that the horses or oxen might get an occasional day of rest as well. Nor did the German Baptists hesitate to denounce the use of intoxicating beverages on Sunday. In addition, they generally objected to Sunday sports; the reading of newspapers and novels; attending a drama, movie, or dance on the Lord's Day; and even to conversation and reflection on secular affairs.[2] How much more Puritan could they have become?

The change in their use of alcoholic beverages was less dramatic. Nevertheless, due to the combined influence of German Pietism and American Protestantism, German Baptists opposed the use of distilled liquors

---

[1]DS, Aug. 10, 1871, p. 122; ibid., June 16, 1886, p. 197; ibid., Feb. 15, 1888, pp. 4-5.

[2]Ibid., Aug. 10, 1871, p. 122; ibid., Sept. 20, 1871, p. 146; ibid., May 24, 1882, p. 164; ibid., June 16, 1886, p. 197; ibid., Feb. 15, 1888, pp. 4-5; ibid., Feb. 22, 1888, p. 4; ibid., Feb 29, 1888, p. 4; ibid., March 7, 1888, p. 5; ibid., April 3, 1889, p. 5; ibid., Dec. 16, 1891, p. 5; ibid., Jan. 11, 1893, p. 4; ibid., Jan. 18, 1893, p. 5.

(Branntwein) from the outset,[1] and as early as 1852 alerted their churches to the advancing evil of intemperance and entreated them to combat it among the Germans to the best of their ability.[2] While they did not object to moderate use of beer and wine, even using wine in communion, they went so far as to order a whole year's supply of communion wine from a Christian wine-grower in Germany to assure that it was pure.[3]

Forced to re-evaluate their position by the sharp increase in the consumption of alcoholic beverages after the Civil War and the progress of the prohibitionist movement in the 1870's, they went a step or two further. While maintaining that imposing total abstinence upon everyone would be fanatical and unscriptural,[4] the influential editor of Der Sendbote shamefully admitted in 1874 that German Baptists had not done enough to warn and witness against the vice of drunkenness, to retrieve the fallen, and to oppose the tycoons of the liquor industry.[5] Recognizing that the danger of intemperance was greater in American than in Germany, because of the rapid temper of life here and the impure quality of American liquors, he announced that the time had come for everyone in the church, school, and home to cooperate in curbing the evil. This was to be done by emphatically warning against tavern-life from the pulpit, especially condemning strong drinks; by informing school children that

---

[1] Home Mission Record, July 1851, p. 42; DS, March 1854, p. 4; ibid., July 1857, p. 52.

[2] Verh. (E), 1852, p. 11; Home Mission Record, Dec. 1858, p. 47.

[3] Verh. (E), 1856, p. 11; DS, Nov. 1858, p. 18.

[4] DS, April 15, 1874, p. 57. [5] Ibid., April 1, 1874, p. 50.

XUM

even the moderate use of wine and beer often becomes a snare; and by never using distilled liquors in the family, except for medicinal purposes, and beer and wine never as a daily drink, except as a remedy in cases of physical weakness or sickness or as a restorative after hard work.[1]

Others were prepared to go even further, asserting that Christians should not drink beer at all on the grounds that it is a stumbling block to others, prevents effective protest against intemperance, and hinders one's Christian witness.[2] By 1877 sufficient numbers approved of such restrictive measures for the General Conference of that year to pass a motion which read:

> Resolved, . . . since the Master's cause is harmed and the Lord's name is profaned by the thoughtless use of beer in taverns, or in families, we declare ourselves, as the General Conference, to be decisively against the habitual use of beer and other alcoholic beverages. And since we as churches should be of one voice on this point, we implore all our churches to press with all earnestness to the end that their members do not resemble the world in the frequenting of taverns, and where they forget themselves, to place them under the stern discipline of the church, thereby to cleanse themselves of this sin.[3]

While not prepared to accept a strict prohibitionist position, the German churches invariably approved of rigid measures against intemperance;[4] it was considered self-evident that every true Christian congregation should also be a temperance society.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., April 8, 1874, p. 54.

[2] Ibid., Sept. 18, 1867, p. 141. See also Schulte, Erinnerrungen, pp. 62-3.

[3] Verh. (Gen.), 1877, p. 22. [4] ABHMS An. Rep., 1885, p. 48.

[5] DS, Feb. 20, 1889, p. 5.

When German-Americans became Baptists, American Baptists also had much less to fear from their possible menace to the political well-being of the country. During this period the German Baptists were for the most part a-political. Viewing party politics as unclean and sinful machinations which contaminate the Christian,[1] they avoided unnecessary involvment in it and particularly anything which smacked of political intrigue. Consequently, they were less vulnerable to the corrupt election practices of the day and disapproved of any unpatriotic or subversive activities.[2]

More positively, they were patriotic and loyal citizens. Because many of them had been personally subjected to religious and political persecution in Germany and the rest sympathized with their co-religionists who continued to receive such treatment there, they had little appreciation left for the political systems of Germany and sincere admiration for the liberties America offered. Moreover, they agreed that a Christian ought to be an obedient subject and responsible citizen.[3] On the basis of this premise, some of their leading pastors during the volatile 1850's and 1860's still advised avoiding any entanglement in the passions of party politics but strongly urged them to contribute to the political welfare of the nation by praying,[4] by helping to establish the kingdom of God,[5] and by ulitizing their right to vote, especially in objection to

---

[1] Ibid., Sept. 15, 1864, p. 46; Verh. (E), 1864, p. 31.

[2] E.g., Home Mission Record, March 1854, p. 22.

[3] DS, July 1854, p. 2; ibid., March 1862, p. 34.

[4] Verh. (E), 1862, p. 22. [5] DS, March 1862, p. 34.

the major evils of the land.[1] Whether or not one should join the army in the event of a war was left to individual consciences. Many of them, including pastors, did join during the Civil War, and the rest publicly declared their support of the Union.[2]

After the achievement of religious liberty in Germany and the unification of that nation in 1870, German immigrants tended to be prouder of their fatherland and less appreciative of America. Among the German Baptists, however, this disposition seems to have been more than offset by a growing emphasis on the Christian's duty to strive after the welfare of the state. They were instructed to seek first the kingdom of God but, in its proper place, also the well being of the nation, which was understood to include not only praying for it and voting responsibly but also defending it in case of attack and employing all constitutional means to combat evil.[3] Like the Americans, they were coming to believe that the best Christian should also be the best patriot,[4] and one notable pastor advised ungrateful immigrants to love America or leave it.[5]

In view of German-American involvement in radical politics, it is particularly noteworthy that the German Baptists denounced such activities almost as strongly as native Americans. Beginning in the early 1880's, they consistently and vigorously opposed socialism, anarchism, and nihil-

---

[1] Ibid., Nov. 1860, p. 18; Verh. (E), 1863, p. 30; ibid., 1864, p. 31.

[2] Verh. (W), 1863, p. 24.

[3] E.g., DS, Aug. 15, 1865, p. 62; ibid., Feb. 9, 1876, p. 45.

[4] Ibid., Jan. 23, 1884, p. 28. [5] Ibid., May 29, 1889, p. 5.

ism.[1] Not until the end of this period did Walter Rauschenbusch make some allowance for Christian Socialism, and it took several years before any significant number of German Baptist sympathized with his perspective.[2]

In some other areas, such as that of language, philosophy of education, and the fine arts, they were less willing to be Americanized indiscriminately. Indeed, their resistance to change in these areas increased during this period. Prior to the Civil War they expected Americanization would be inevitable and accepted the fate. Under pressure from the nativists, some of them even became ashamed of their ethnic distinctions and sought closer identity with native Americans.[3] Following the War, however, a reaction set in. To assure that his children would be raised "as German children" and in the hope that they would devote themselves to the welfare of German-Americans, August Rauschenbusch went so far as to send them to Germany with their mother and to German schools there for two years, even though it necessitated being separated from them for this period of time.[4] Most German Baptists shared his esteem for German scholarship, music, and the German language and were reluctant to relinguish them.[5]

Several developments help to account for this change of mind.

---

[1]E.g., ibid., April 29, 1885, pp. 140-1; ibid., May 18, 1887, p. 5; Andreas Heinrich, Laura, die Sozialistenbraut (Cleveland: Druck und Verlag des Publikations-Verein der deutschen Baptisten, 1888); DS, May 18, 1892, p. 5; ibid., Sept. 28, 1892, p. 5.

[2]DS, April 25, 1894, p. 5. [3]Ibid., Sept. 15, 1864, p. 46.

[4]Ibid., May 8, 1867, p. 74.

[5]Ibid., June 11, 1873, p. 94: ibid., Aug. 2, 1876, p. 237.

After the heavy German immigration during the 1840's and 1850's, German-Americans had become the largest single nationality and dominant cultural group in numerous rural areas and urban centers.[1] Consequently, it was no longer simply assumed that Americanization was imminent and irresistible.

A growing number of them, in fact, began to resist Americanization, particularly when pressured and proded into reaction by the nativists and Know-Nothings.[2] Prominent among them were the well-educated and culturally astute Forty-Eighters. They were frequently among the more highly cultured in their localities and legitimately regarded assimilation into the surrounding American society as stooping to an inferior culture. To prevent and counteract such condescension, they organized turner societies and literary clubs, founded private and parochial schools, and published German newspapers.

The consequent explosion of German journalism in itself was a major deterrent to Americanization. While to some extent German newspapers accelerated the process of assimilation by interesting their readers in American politics, history, and social issues, they also "exerted a conservative influence on their patronage by upholding the German language and increasing their pride in German culture and civilization."[3]

---

[1]Wittke, op. cit., pp. 212-4.

[2]Ibid., pp. 195f; Faust, op. cit., II, 392; Hansen, op. cit., p. 136.

[3]Faust, op. cit., II, 365-6.

This influence became particularly significant after 1870. For the unification of Germany and its phenomenal economic progress after that date also aroused increased pride in its cultural heritage. Carl Wittke observed:

> The whole tone of the German-American press changed as a result of these developments to one of glorification and praise for German progress and of pride in the German nation. A concerted effort was launched on the part of many German-American leaders to preserve the German language and German culture as long as possible in the United States.[1]

German private schools were beginning to wane, but only to be replaced by the much broader teaching of German in the public schools.

Naturally, German Baptists were also influenced by these developments. They were not entirely opposed to cultural Americanization. They readily acknowledged that American culture had many good features which were worth adopting and were prepared to do so. But as a rule they maintained that Americanization should not proceed at the expense of all that is German. Rather the assimilation process should be a two-way affair, in which Germans accept the good in American culture, while at the same time retaining the best in their culture and bringing it with them into American culture.[2] In other words, during this period already they were advocating what later became known as the melting-pot approach to Americanization.

Their views on cultural Americanization can be most easily discerned in the much debated language question. During the 1850's and early

---

[1]Wittke, op. cit., p. 211. See also DS, May 15, 1889.

[2]DS, Oct. 1862, p. 15.

1860's, when, on the one hand, they still expected that the use of German would soon be discontinued in America and, on the other, already realized that a working knowledge of English was necessary to succeed here, they advised new arrivals to learn the language of the land as soon as possible.[1] Furthermore, maintaining that all German ministers in America should be able to witness to their faith in English and that for German Baptist ministers it was practically a necessity, in order to participate in the association meetings of their American brethren, August Rauschenbusch encouraged his students to do some work in the English Department of Rochester Theological Seminary[2] and even taught a preparatory English course to students in the German Department.[3]

After the Civil War, when it began to appear that German would continue to be used for some time,[4] they were more reluctant to promote English. They nevertheless had to concede that some of the reasons previously espoused for learning the language of the land still obtained.[5]

This development can be seen, for example, in the Sunday schools. Since Sunday school work was something new for German Baptists, it was fairly common at first for churches to invite experienced teachers from American Baptist churches to teach the classes and train German teachers. Consequently, in many churches the schools were more English than German.[6]

---

[1] Ibid., Sept. 1854, p. 2.

[2] Ibid., Aug. 15, 1864, p. 87; ibid., Dec. 1858, p. 23.

[3] Ibid., July 1862, p. 2. [4] Ibid., Jan. 4, 1871, p. 1.

[5] E.g., ibid., Feb. 11, 1885, p. 51. [6] Ibid., Feb. 24, 1892, p. 2.

XUM

In the face of decisive opposition from the Eastern Conference, the practice was soon discontinued. But by the end of this period, English was again coming back into the Sunday schools, with a growing number of them at least partly conducted in English and using English materials.[1]

The transition from German to English was most apparent among the young people. Having received their education in English, they naturally made increasing use of the language at home as well as at school. And having been raised in this country, they also identified with American nationalism. Therefore, they resented being regarded as foreigners and intentionally sought to identify themselves more closely with native Americans. By the 1870's some even began to attend English churches.[2]

Meanwhile, the seminary continued to encourage its students to acquire at least a working knowledge of English. As a matter of fact, it required them to study the language during two years of their pre-theological training.[3] Before a second instructor had been appointed (1872), some students even did their pre-seminary work mainly in English at the Free Academy in Rochester.[4] During the theological program itself, some of them took courses in the English Department. And following the completion of the German program, many continued their studies at the University of Rochester and at Rochester Theological Seminary. By 1889, forty-

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1892, 1st App., p. 1.

[2] DS, May 14, 1879, p. 157; Krueger, op. cit., p. 48.

[3] Verh. (Gen.), 1874, p. 8. DS, Dec. 5, 1883, p. 380.

[4] NYBUME An. Rep., 1871, p. 25.

three students had done at least some work in the English seminary, with the blessing and assistance of the German Department.[1] Some opposition to this practice was expressed during the early 1880's,[2] but it was continued,[3] and by 1892 three preparatory courses in the German Department itself were being taught in English[4] and others were specifically designed to help prepare the students for continued studies in the English institutions.[5]

By the end of this period, the use of English was even beginning to penetrate into the last stronghold of the German language, namely the Sunday worship services. Recognizing that some people of German descent in the older settlements of the country had lost the use of their mother tongue, the Eastern Conference began this "New Departure" in 1878 by appointing a missionary to work in the Susquehanna valley, employing the English language.[6] And by the late 1880's some pastors of German churches in the same areas began preaching in English.[7] Despite considerable

---

[1]Ibid., 1870, p. 26; ibid., 1873, p. 33; Verh. (Gen.), 1871, p. 64; DS, 17, 1873, p. 198.

[2]Die deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden des Westens, Verhandlungen der Central-, Südwestlichen und Nordwestlichen Jahres-Konferenzen (Cleveland, 1882), p. 10; Kuhn, op. cit., p. 76.

[3]Walter R. Betteridge, Albert J. Ramaker, and Josiah R. Henderson, Rochester Theological Seminary General Catalogue, 1850 to 1900 (Rochester: E. R. Andrews, Printer, 1900), p. 264.

[4]Verh. (Gen.), 1892, 2nd App., p. v.

[5]NYBUME An. Rep., 1889, p. 36; ibid., 1891, p. 40.

[6]Verh. (E), 1878, p. 8.

[7]DS, June 16, 1886, p. 195; ibid., Jan. 2, 1889, p. 3.

opposition, the innovation continued to spread.[1]

From the very outset, however, German Baptists did not intent English to entirely replace German. At their first conference, the representatives of the churches present unanimously adopted a resolution stating:

> We consider it highly important and desirable that our children are instructed in the German language and therefore recommend that our churches establish German Sunday schools and, where possible, also German day schools.[2]

And when some of the churches employed English teachers to fill vacancies in the Sunday schools, the Eastern Conference further resolved:

> In order that our members may not lose this fine and blessed work and our children be enabled to read and understand God's Word in their mother tongue, and in order that they might thereby possibly be retained in our churches, we should strive to support only German Sunday schools.[3]

Similarly, while appreciative of the Rochester Theological Seminary's offer to provide ministerial education for German students, the conference stipulated:

> That we, however, sincerely and candidly explain to our American brethren that it will have to be carefully watched that the German students at Rochester not lose the knowledge and use of their mother tongue but rather develop and perfect themselves especially in it. Should this happen, however, we do not regard it advisable, as a rule, that they acquire such fluency in the English language as to be able readily to preach in it, because it is highly probably that they will then not speak their mother tongue purely and fluently enough and in the end would preside over an English and not a German church.[4]

By the 1870's the German Baptists were even more determined to

---

[1] Verh. (E), 1889, p. 17. [2] Ibid., 1851, p. 8.

[3] Ibid., 1861, p. 15. See also DS, Dec. 1861, p. 22.

[4] Verh. (E), 1851, p. 8.

retain German while learning English. Until then they seem to have done so mainly for sentimental reasons and a belief in the superiority of the German language.[1] But they soon observed that German was of increasing practical value. With several million German-speaking people in the country, a knowledge of their language was useful in business. Even many Americans wished they could acquire it to use as a means of securing the patronage of German-Americans.[2] In addition, it was gaining increasing educational and cultural value. As American appreciation of German literature and scholarship grew, so did their interest in the linguistic key to that treasure.[3] As early as 1872 someone remarked:

> It is no compliment for an intelligent man now-a-days to know only one language. The time is coming and is already here, in which it will be considered a sad deficiency in "colleges" and other institutions of higher learning, as well as among civil servants, teachers, and business people, if one does not know German, because, in spite of all that, the German language has become an American language and will also remain one as long as immigration continues.[4]

That was somewhat of an exaggeration, but it does indicate a trend, and a growing number of Americans were trying to learn the language.

In view of these developments, it seemed entirely incongruous to German Baptists that they should discontinue the use of German. Why, they reasoned, should they relinquish the very thing many Americans were expending considerable money and effort to acquire?[5] Should they not instead learn as many languages as possible? Surely being a good American

---

[1] DS, Oct. 1862, p. 15; ibid., May 8, 1867, p. 73.

[2] Ibid., Feb. 10, 1869, p. 21. [3] Ibid., Sept. 3, 1873, p. 139.

[4] Ibid., May 8, 1872, p. 74.

[5] Ibid., Sept. 3, 1873, p. 139; ibid., Nov. 26, 1873, p. 186.

XUM

could not be dependent on speaking only English. That line of reasoning would lead to the ridiculous conclusion that the less one knows the better citizen he would become.[1]

At this point, however, they clashed with some American Baptists. Many key leaders among the latter recognized the temporary necessity of employing the German language to reach German-speaking people and even the value of retaining some knowledge of German after learning English.[2] Some others, however, who feared that two languages divide the citizenry, disturb the unity of the republic, and hinder national development, and who still thought Americanization essentially meant that foreigners divest themselves of their ethnic distinctions and take kindly to this country's government, adopt its customs, acquire its language, wear its clothes, and blend with its people into a single and homogeneous nation, became impatient with the German Baptists and strongly urged that they begin bilingual churches or even entirely discontinue the use of German.[3]

In 1882 Dr. D. C. Potter, pastor of the First Baptist Church of New York city, blew the issue wide open with two articles in the Examiner.[4] For in them he contended that most aliens were anxious to become Americanized. Germans, in particular, could not await the time when they

---

[1]Ibid., May 8, 1872, p. 74.

[2]ABHMS An. Rep., 1875, p. 32; ibid., 1880, pp. 24, 34; DS, March 21, 1883, p. 92; NYBUME An. Rep., 1884, p. 18; BHMM, Feb. 1887, p. 40.

[3]ABHMS An. Rep., 1882, pp. 134-5; ibid., 1885, p. 16; DS, May 8, 1872, p. 74; ibid., June 7, 1882, p. 180.

[4]Examiner, May 18, 1882, p. 5; ibid., June 22, 1882, p. 5.

would forget that they were Germans. Children and young people, especially, detested the German language and German customs and wanted to be Americans and to attend English churches as soon as possible. Their parents could constrain them to speak German and to attend German churches only by means of threatenings and beatings. And to have done so not only produced bitings and endless strife but was downright cruel. Therefore, the German Sunday schools should be abolished and the children quickly taken to English ones. The German language itself should be abandoned and all non-English churches eliminated as soon as possible. Perhaps something would need to be done for the old people, but pastors were definitely not to be educated in German in order to perpetuate congregations of foreigners. Accordingly--and this was the last straw--the ABHMS should Americanize the immigrants even before evangelizing them.

To make matters worse, the editor of the Examiner and an apostasized German Baptist pastor came to the support of Dr. Potter.[1] The latter went so far as to assert:

> The majority of the older members of our German Baptist churches make the most strenuous exertions to induce their children to speak the German language. They fail, not because of any lack of zeal, but because their children naturally take to American society and customs, and from choice prefer to speak the English language. . . .
> . . . . . .
> As to the means by which foreigners are to be evangelized, there seems to be but one way, that will prove itself to be a sure and successful way. It is to preach the gospel in the language most dominant in our country to all who are able to understand the preaching in that language, and to preach in any foreign language only when necessity really demands it.

A distinct German denomination or a distinct church organization

---

[1] Ibid., May 25, 1882, p. 4; ibid., July 6, 1882, p. 2; ibid., May 2, 1889, p. 4.

> among the Germans . . . seems to me unnecessary. It has, in my estimation proved itself worse than a failure. The majority of the young people prefer a service in the English language, and without the young people the perpetuation of distinct German churches becomes an impossibility. . . .
>
> The training of young men to become the pastor of small and weak German churches, who in all their future will be obliged to eke out a miserable existence, is nonsensical and absurd, and will prove itself ever to be a disastrous and impractical expenditure of denominational time, talent, and money.[1]

To these critics, the German Baptists replied that the use of the German language was definitely necessary to continue their mission to German-Americans. It was obviously necessary to communicate with new arrivals who had not yet learned any English. And to disregard them would be to lose an entire generation for the church or to other German denominations. The use of German, therefore, was imperative as long as immigration continued. Secondly, it was necessary to reach those who immigrated when they were already too old to learn English or, at least, to learn it well enough to understand English preaching. In addition, there were those whose conditions, associations, and surroundings were such that they could acquire barely enough English to buy and sell in that language and not nearly enough to benefit from religious conversation in English.[2] They could be won to the church only by preaching and fellowship in their own language. In any event, if Baptists did not appeal to them in German, they would be lost to other German denominations which had large numbers of German churches, a strong German ministry, and German publications. Indeed, every minute spend in deliberating

---

[1] Ibid., July 6, 1882, p. 2.

[2] NYBUME An. Rep., 1868, p. 23; BHMM, Feb. 1880, p. 27.

which language was to be used resulted in losses to those competing denominations.[1]

By that time they could also appeal to experience as a verification of these claims. In earlier years some American Baptist churches had attempted to evangelize German-Americans directly but found the language and cultural barriers almost insurmountable. Germans among them could be gathered into congregations by themselves to listen to a sermon in their own language, but only a few of them could be induced to go to a place of worship designed for another people or profit from services conducted in a foreign language.[2] Consequently, the churches that had managed to win some German members--usually because of the inaccessibility of German churches--generally had permitted and even encouraged these members to hold services in their own language[3] and helped them to organize and establish their own churches, when they were prepared for that step.[4]

Since Germans, like most immigrants, preferred their mother tongue, the same was true in other areas of life as well. As one pastor noted:

> It is well understood by business men and politicians, that the Germans can best be influenced in their own language. For this reason they employ clerks who can speak German; they find that it is important for commercial travelers to speak German, in order to sell them their good. And the politicians, when important elections are at hand, send out speakers to address them in German, and spend thousands to circulate papers and political tracts in German.

---

[1] BHMM, Feb. 1880, pp. 27-9. [2] NYBUME An. Rep., 1854, p. 29.

[3] As in Springfield, Illinois and St. Louis, Missouri.

[4] As in New York city; Rochester, New York; and many others.

To which he added, "Should Christians, in order to lead them to the knowledge of the truth, be less wise than the children of this world?"[1]

Therefore, it seemed unwise, if not absurd, to withhold the gospel from the immigrants until they had learned the English language. Thousands of souls would perish or be lost to other denominations, while Baptists waited for Americanization. Should these immortal souls, the Germans asked, be sacrificed upon the altars of national prejudice? Moreover, according to the prevailing convictions of American Baptists themselves, was evangelization not the best means of Americanization. Even if in the process Americanization were retarded, and influential pastor asked:

> What argument is that aginst giving to them the Gospel in the only way in which it can be given to them? Our first duty is not to the country in which we live, but to God and to the souls of men. We are Christians first and Americans next, and we should, in allegiance to our King, seek to win Him souls in whatever way it can best be done.[2]

If the Son of God assumed human nature for man's salvation, should one not dare to accomodate to the Germans in order to win them?

Most of the American Baptists could have agreed with the defence to this point. The ABHMS had observed some of the same phenomena and explained its concurrence as follows:

> Having welcomed people of other nationalities to our shores, as Christians we must make the most of our opportunites for their evangelization; without pausing for heated discussion whether the bread of life be conveyed to them in German-silver or American-silver dishes. It is important, above all things, that they be Christianized in the quickest way possible. The method of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost is the safe and wise one still to follow--to

---

[1] BHMM, Nov. 1882, p. 297. [2] Ibid., Feb. 1880, p. 29.

give the Gospel to every man in his own tongue wherein he was born[1] On those grounds, it helped to support men who could pastor the German churches and found new ones.

Similar reasons lead to the establishment of the German Department of Rochester Theological Seminary. When its board of trustees first offered to provide ministerial education to German students, it had in mind a course of studies especially designed for the needs of these students but taught in English.[2] Because of the students limited knowledge of English and inability to benefit from the program offered, it soon became clear:

> It is of the utmost consequence that the young men studying at this Institution for the work of the Gospel Ministry among the Germans of the United States be thoroughly instructed in their own language. In order to do that, they need an accomplished teacher who shall be himself a German. It is in vain to expect that for many years to come, at least, the Germans of this country are to adopt our language or in any great degree become changed in their peculiar sympathies and preferences. Those who are to hold an influential standing among them as Gospel ministers must be men speaking their tongue, and so skilled in it as to secure to themselves the reputation of intelligence as well as piety. Meanwhile, there is danger lest if these young men pursue their studies here too much under instructors who are not Germans, they may lose, in some degree, both the interest they need to feel in the study of their own language, and in consequence of this, the power of using it readily and fluently. It is needed, therefore, that there be a man placed at the head of this Department, who will be able to take it wholly into his own hands and capable of giving thorough instruction in all that may be necessary to fit young men for efficient service as preachers of the Gospel amongst the Germans; and that he should be sufficiently free from other duties, to enable him to give the full vigor of his mind, and the best of his time to the duties of his professorship.[3]

---

[1]ABHMS, Baptist Home Mission, p. 471. See also ABHMS An. Rep., 1852, pp. 18, 34-5.

[2]DS, Aug. 7, 1895, p. 1; ibid., March 17, 1897, p. 6.

[3]NYBUME An. Rep., 1853, pp. 19-20. See also ibid., 1854, p. 29; ibid., 1868, p. 23; DS, May 31, 1871, p. 86; ibid., June 11, 1879, p. 189.

Accordingly, August Rauschenbusch was appointed to start a separate department, with a course of studies designed by himself and taught in German, even though it was "not consistent with the general tendency or policy of American Baptist institutions, which is to Americanize and nationalize all foreign elements as speedily as possible."[1]

What American Baptists disapproved of, however, was the fact that the German churches also held fast to the children, young people, and others who could speak English and supposedly retarded their Americanization by instructing them in German. This seemed to be a sure sign that the German mission was attempting to perpetuate itself rather than functioning as the stepping-stone to American Baptist churches which it was intended to be.

The German Baptists, on the other hand, soon discovered that the demand for German churches and pastors constantly exceeded their means. To have confined the mission only to new arrivals and the elderly, therefore, would only have diminished its capacity even further. Being unable to justify such a reduction in what they regarded as their God-given task, they openly and unreservedly tried to enlist and hold their youthful forces. And to do so, even their critics agreed, they needed German Sunday schools, in which the young could learn to read and understand the Scriptures in German, to benefit from German preaching, and to prepare for future positions of leadership.[2]

---

[1] NYBUME An. Rep., 1860, p. 10.

[2] Verh. (E), 1861, p. 15; DS, Sept. 9, 1868, p. 140; Verh. (W), 1871, p. 10; DS, Aug. 11, 1880, p. 253; ibid., Oct. 9, 1889, p. 5.

The parents conceded that some self-seeking young people preferred to attend English-speaking churches but resolutely denied that they were forcefully binding their children to the German churches. They maintained that the young people were staying in the German churches because of their love for their people and God's work among them, being convinced that they were helping to establish and foreward a valuable mission to German-Americans.[1]

In connection with the young, German Baptists also argued that the German language was necessary for purposes of religious education. How could German parents, who could not express themselves in English, instruct their children, if the latter did not also understand German? If attempted in broken English, it would not carry much influence among the young. How then could these parents raise up good American citizens in a land where so much religious education had to be done in the home?[2]

The German Baptists, therefore, emphatically protested that the use of German in their work was not to perpetuate either the language or the mission. They were not perpetuating the language for its own sake. More than that, they declared, "We are totally against German politics, German Sunday observance, and an exaggerated emphasis on German ways and customs."[3] Nor they claimed, were they attempting to perpetuate the mission, but only trying to keep it strong and effective as long as it

---

[1] DS, July 19, 1882, p. 221; ibid., July 26, 1882, p. 228.

[2] Ibid., Oct. 28, 1874, p. 162; ibid., Aug. 23, 1882, p. 261; BHMM, Nov. 1882, p. 298; Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 13.

[3] DS, Nov. 26, 1873, p. 186.

was needed to evangelize German-Americans, after which they expected it would be abandoned.[1] What they were advocating, instead, was efficiency in the use of both German and English.[2]

Nor, they insisted, was this approach inconsistent with a true program of Americanization. On the contrary, they agreed that the Germans should be Americanized as soon as possible.[3] Where they disagreed was in the meaning of Americanization. They increasingly and repeatedly contended that it did not consist in relinquishing one's culture, speaking only English, and adopting some superficial American customs. "If this were sufficient," one of them remarked, tongue in cheek,

> then every bigoted Irish Roman Catholic, who acknowledges the Pontiff in Rome as his sovereign, who considers his laws as of greater authority than the laws of our land, and who would do his utmost to bring us all in subjection to the Pope, would be a good American, for he can speak the English language with fluency, and no other.[4]

Surely, every true American would prefer a patriotic German, even if he could speak only half a dozen words in English.

Being a good American, a leading pastor alleged, meant upholding the principles laid down in the constitution of the land. And a fundamental concept of the Union is that all nationalities, languages, and customs have an equal right, as long as they do not contradict the consti-

---

[1] ABHMS, Baptist Home Missions, pp. 127, 133; DS, July 19, 1882, p. 221; BHMM, Nov. 1882, p. 299.

[2] DS, Aug. 2, 1876, p. 237; ibid., Oct. 1854, p. 2.

[3] BHMM, Nov. 1882, pp. 296-7.

[4] Ibid. See also DS, July 19, 1882, p. 220; BHMM, Sept. 1894, p. 372.

tution. No one language or culture is prescribed for everyone. Therefore, the use of German is not un-American. To the contrary, it is the attempt to eliminate foreign nationalities, languages, and customs which contradicts the constitution and is opposed to the basic concepts of the Union.[1]

Furthermore, they agreed with American Baptists that the best method of Americanizing the Germans was to evangelize them. For the Bible teaches the morality necessary for the welfare of the state and, even more specifically, the principles for which America stands.[2]

From this perspective, the German Baptists were not only in the process of being Americanized but also agents of the process. Although still using the German language, many of them did not hesitate to claim that they were "as truly Americans and loyal citizens of this Great Republic as any native-born American can be."[3] Besides, they were bringing Germans into the light of the gospel (supposedly the surest means of Americanization) and were successfully representing "all that is dear to the loyal American Baptist heart among the masses."[4] Walter Rauschenbusch opined:

> The German Baptist churches are organs for the slow and organic assimilation of the Germans in this country. Men in various states

---

[1] DS, Dec. 17, 1890, p. 5.

[2] Verh. (W), 1867, p. 10; DS, Sept. 22, 1869, p. 146; BHMM, Feb. 1880, p. 29; ibid., Nov. 1882, p. 297; ibid., Sept. 1894, p. 372.

[3] BHMM, Sept. 1894, p. 372. See also ABHMS, Baptist Home Missions, p. 127.

[4] ABHMS An. Rep., 1888, p. 63.

> of assimilation mingle there, and the process goes on more surely than if people who know only English and others who know only German were thrown together. The pastors almost without exception know both languages and mediate between them. The thoughts and views dominant in the churches are American, expressed in German language. We honestly believe that a young man born in this country can serve his country better as an Americanizing force by remaining with a German church than if he merges himself in an American church.[1]

Another of their leaders wagered with the American Baptists:

> As the years roll by you will look back and say, that one of the best things ever done on this continent, was to take the German as he came to America, and to Americanize him by transforming the very language and customs that he brought with him, and, by the use of those customs, by that language and by those old sympathies, to lift him on to the broad plane of American citizenship as well as into our denomination.[2]

Perhaps still another brother most aptly described their situation when he affirmed, "We do not so much wish to perpetuate the German tongue in America as we wish to perpetuate American ideas by means of the German tongue."[3]

The ultimate objective of the mission, however, was institutional assimilation. It was hoped and expected that the German Baptists would become sufficiently Americanized so as not to need their ethnic churches any longer and to be fully assimilated into American Baptist churches and denominational organizations. In this regard the mission got off to a poor start and even retrogressed in some respects during the years under consideration.

As already noted, the mission required ethnic churches and a German seminary. Most American Baptists saw the need and accepted this

---

[1] *Examiner*, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 13.

[2] ABHMS, *Baptist Home Missions*, p. 137. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

arrangement. But it was understood by all concerned that the German churches, and consequently also the German Department of the seminary, were only to be provisional, merely stepping-stones to eventual assimilation into American Baptists institutions. A policy statement of the ABHMS made this clear:

> However much it may be the desire and policy of the Board to blend all suitable foreign materials with our native churches, and use our influence in rendering the population of the country as homogeneous in religious character and action as possible, it is evidently the dictate of true benevolence to afford aid for a time to such distinctive organizations [foreign-speaking churches]. . . . Thousands of them [immigrants] will never become familiar with our language, but if addressed in their mother tongue, they will hear the blessed truths of divine inspiration, and may believe and be benefited by them temporally and spiritually. They may generally, though not universally, remain isolated in their social and religious organization, but their children, whether of foreign or native birth, will be educated in the language and customs of our country and amalgamate with society as it exists around them, rendering such distinctive organizations unnecessary, except for the preparatory objects originally intended.[1]

As a matter of course, however, the German Baptists tended toward greater independence and organizational permanence. For in addition to their ethnic churches, they also organized their own conferences. Most of the first churches founded had joined the American Baptist associations in the areas in which they were located. But some of the older pastors soon concluded that in this relationship alone

> the distinctive needs of [the German churches] are not being met, firstly because of the language, since only very few of their members can participate in the deliberations of these American Baptist annual meetings, and secondly also because of the outward circumstances, which are entirely different in our young German churches from those of the old American churches. As we Germans can be truly edified only in a German worship service, so we will also take the liveliest and most active interest in cooperation for the kingdom of God only where everything is discussed in our mother tongue.[2]

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1850, p. 22. [2] DS, Sept. 1853, p. 2.

Thus, feeling the need for a closer, voluntary union, "in which a close acquaintance with one another, deep sharing of our mutual joyous and painful experiences, and above all the opportunity for joint consultation, instruction, and prayer should be attained,"[1] they met together in November of 1851 and organized their own German association, termed a conference.

Soon the conference included churches scattered from New York city to Pine Oak Creek, Missouri. This created a further problem. Because most of the churches were very poor, it became impossible to bring a strong representation of their pastors together in one place each year for the annual session of the conference.[2] Consequently, in 1859 the original organization was divided into a eastern and a western conference, separated roughly by the Appalachian Mountains. And to coordinate the activities of these regional conferences, a general conference was created in 1865.

These conferences were intended to supplement the American Baptist associations and state conventions rather than to supplant them.[3] Although in a sense the German Baptist churches were more centrally organized then the mother denomination, in that they had one conference representing all their churches till 1859 and after 1865, they thought of themselves and their conference(s) as a part of the larger denomination.

---

[1] Ibid. See also Verh. (E), 1852, p. 2; DS, Aug. 1858, p. 6.

[2] Verh. (E), 1858, p. 7; DS, Nov. 1858, p. 18; ibid., Aug. 1859, p. 54.

[3] DS, Sept. 1853, p. 2.

Accordingly, those churches which had been affiliated with American Baptist associations before 1851 were advised to continue in that relationship,[1] new ones organized after that date were expected to join those organizations besides the German conferences[2] and all of them were urged to support the American Baptist benevolent societies.[3] Delegates of American Baptist churches, in turn, were called upon to participate in the dedication of German Baptist churches, in ordination services, and in church councils. American Baptists, too, simply regarded the German conference as merely so many more associations within the larger denomination,[4] and viewing them as a temporary necessity, even participated in their founding.

In fact, however, the German conferences, and especially the General Conference, made for a strong sense of self-identity on the part of the German churches and for increasing estrangement from their American brethren. Having their own annual conference sessions, the Germans felt less need for participating in American Baptist association and state convention meetings and a greater sense of not belonging when they did attend.

This development was even further accentuated after 1869, when they also began to organize their own associations. Together with their own mission societies, publication society, women's missionary societies, and so forth, they had acquired all the trappings of a separate denomination. Though not intenting to sever themselves entirely from the mother orga-

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Home Mission Record, Nov. 1853, p. 5.

[3] Verh. (E), 1857, p. 12. [4] E.g., ABPS An. Rep., 1853, p. 33.

nization, they had virtually created a German Baptist denomination within the larger American Baptist body. As Walter Rauschenbusch so picturesquelly described the relationship, the German churches

> are related to the denomination like a gulf to the sea, sharing its saltness, rising and falling with its tides, swept by the roll of its waves, and yet having its own currents, its own marine life, its own coasting trade.[1]

The attempted assimilation of German-Americans into American Baptist churches was not a complete failure. It was estimated in 1891 that, in addition to the sixteen thousand who were being prepared for assimilation in the German churches, those who had already transferred their membership, together with their families, numbered around nine thousand. A single church in New York city had given three hundred of its members to the English-speaking churches. And many of these transferees were prominent and influential men, standing in the front ranks of their respective congregations.[2]

Institutionally, however, the two denominations had only grown further apart. Of course, they cooperated closely in home missions, but that was more of a financial arrangement than an ecclesiastical one.[3] Toward the end of this period, a drive was begun to encourage German churches to join American Baptist state conventions, to attend their meetings, and to participate in their business sessions. But here, again, the underlying motive, although suggested by an American Baptist, was to promote

---

[1] Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 12.

[2] BHMM, Nov. 1891, pp. 303, 307, 313-4; ABHMS An. Rep., 1892, p. 67; ibid., 1894, pp. 93-4.

[3] DS, Oct. 18, 1871, p. 158.

the German work in American Baptist circles and to solicit more financial support for it, rather than to move toward a denominational merger.[1]

Even the temporary and transitional nature of the German mission was beginning to be questioned. During most of this period, it was generally assumed that the German churches were a provisional foreign mission agency for the larger denomination, serving as a bridge by which German-Americans would naturally pass over into the English churches, and terminating as soon as their mission had been accomplished.[2] But by the end of this period, some were expecting the German immigration to continue for many years and the need for the mission to exist even longer, suggesting that it had a long, and possibly independent, future still ahead.[3]

Thus while the evangelization of German-Americans proved to be relatively successful, their Americanization met with somewhat mixed success. They adapted readily to American religion and politics but had reservations about making the expected cultural transition. And in regards to institutional assimilation, which was to be the culmination of the Americanization process, they actually retrogressed rather than progressing.

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1889, p. 96; Verh. (E), 1890, p. 16; NYBUME An. Rep. 1890, p. 20.

[2] ABHMS, Baptist Home Missions, p. 475; DS, July 19, 1882, p. 221; BHMM, Sept. 1894, p. 373.

[3] DS, Feb. 8, 1893, p. 46; ibid., Oct. 16, 1895, p. 4. See also Verh. (E), 1872, p. 9; DS, Aug. 5, 1874, p. 114; ibid., Sept. 1, 1875, p. 268.

PART III

THE DRIFT TOWARD INDEPENDENCE

1893-1940

CHAPTER 7

ACCEPTING GERMAN-AMERICANS AS PARTNERS

After 1893 American Baptists dramatically reversed their evaluation of German-Americans. Whereas previously they had judged these newcomers to be in urgent need of Americanization, now they accepted the German-Americans as fellow Nordics and, more than that, as partners in the defense of American culture. As a result, their motivation for the mission also underwent a major change. Whereas previously Americanization had been a vital factor in that motivation, it now subsided and waned into insignificance. Ironically, just at the time when most American denominations were devising more specific programs of Americanization, those concerns came to figure less and less in the American Baptist mission to German-Americans.

It is not that American Baptists suddenly rejected the pattern of motivation under which they had functioned before. Most of their basic line of reasoning about American's mission and destiny, the immigrants' threat to that destiny, and the consequent need to evangelize and to Americanize them remained in tact.[1] Changing circumstances and patterns of thought suggested some modifications at points, but the overall pattern was still clearly recognizable.

---

[1]E.g., BHMM, Aug. 1900, p. 226. The same was true of American nativism generally (Higham, op. cit., p. 77).

Concerning their conception of America's mission and destiny, for instance, American Baptists, like most Americans, still had a clear sense of national purpose and direction. Their earlier vision of a large and powerful nation had come a long way toward being realized. It therefore diminished in importance, but did not leave them without a reason for being. It only resulted in a shift of emphasis. With the Americans' self-proclaimed mission to the world at large still unfulfilled, the focus of concern merely shifted from internals to externals, from continentalism to imperialism, foreign missions, and the crusade to keep the world safe for demoncracy.

Moreover, this global conception of America's mission and destiny seems to have been taken at least as seriously as the country's national responsibilities. As has been shown, it was already a major motivational force in the previous decades. Now it was further reinforced by a vigorous revival of Anglo-Saxonism[1] and the belief that God had endowed Anglo-Saxons with the two great principles of spiritual religion and civil liberty because he was entrusting them with the welfare of the world. That was clearly a gigantic task and was recognized as such, making for a powerful sense of world missions.

Applying this line of reasoning to the events of the 1890's, American Baptists came to view the Spanish-American War as imposed upon them by their divinely appointed duty. Since Cuba fell within their sphere of special responsibility, it was their duty to God, themselves, civilization,

---

[1]Thomas F. Gossett, Race: The History of an Idea in America (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), chapter XIII; Higham, op. cit., chapter VI.

XUM

and humanity to help free their neighbors from the barbaric cruelty of their Spanish overlords.[1] The ultimatum presented to Spain in April of 1898 was "a righteous demand,"[2] and the war itself was God's. For after the victory in Manila harbor, the editor of the Examiner remarked, "We should remember that God is using us as his weapon in this conflict for the punishment of a great crime against humanity. . . . We are but the rod of God's anger, the staff in our hand his indignation."[3] The solid victory, the limited losses, and the speedy peace further reinforced their convictions.[4]

Their Anglo-Saxon racism reinforced by Kipling's concept of the white man's burden led to a similar sense of moral responsibility for the Philippines, after the Spaniards were driven out of the islands. The editor of the Examiner again sounded a common note when he wrote:

> It has been from the first, our sincere conviction that we cannot, without recreancy to duty, shirk the responsibility providentially laid upon us of caring for these hapless people, incapable of self-government as they manifestly are, until they have learned what freedom means, and are able to care for themselves.[5]

After the Spanish-American War the imperialistic expressions of Anglo-Saxonism diminished. Viewed psychologically, Americans had proven to themselves that they were capable of exerting world-wide political, military, and economic influence. Thereafter, they could, at least in part, rest upon their laurels. But Anglo-Saxonism and a sense of Amer-

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1897, p. 27; Examiner, Dec. 9, 1897.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1898, p. 6. [3] Examiner, May 5, 1898, p. 1.

[4] Ibid., Aug. 11, 1898, p. 1. [5] Ibid., Jan. 26, 1899, p. 1.

XUM

ica's global mission were not dead. For American Christians the emphasis was only shifted from military imperialism to world missions. As stewards of spiritual Christianity and as bearers of the white man's burden, they still bore a heavy sense of responsibility for the evangelization of all men. The Student Volunteer Movement and the Laymen's Missionary Movement reflect some of that concern.

One American Baptist explained the rationale and sentiments of his denomination as follows:

> Why should we lay stress upon the work of preaching the gospel in America? Because America's influence, financially, industrially, commercially, and politically dominates the world. It is of the highest importance that this influence should be Christian in character and in its effect. The salvation of heathen nations, with all that that means of civilization, moral elevation and ultimate destiny, depends, more than upon all else, upon America. The means and the men for time to come must be furnished by America, for the fields around the world. America is better fitted than any other nation to the work of extending Christianity. . . . The plans of God working out through modern events, seem to indicate that God has set America in the midst of the nations for the winning of the world to Himself.[1]

Before this enthusiasm and sense of duty for overseas missions had run its course, World War I aroused Americans to still another grand national crusade; to make the world safe for democracy. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to speak of another shift of emphasis in America's conception of its responsibility to the world. Fostering American institutions abroad was not an entirely new concern, for foreign missions was thought to include or result in social change, civilization, economic betterment, and moral improvement of formerly benighted lands as well as in spiritual enlightenment.[2] What the War did was only to direct atten-

---

[1] Home Mission Echoes, Oct. 1905, p. 1. [2] Beaver, op. cit., pp. 145-6.

tion primarily to the specific need for reconstructing the world on the principles of American democracy.

American Baptists were among those who viewed the War as a crusade "in defence of humanity, liberty, and democracy," and in an official statement of the Northern Baptist Convention solemnly pledged their "whole-hearted allegiance and support" to the president and government of the United States. They fully dedicated themselves to this "just and righteous cause," and vowed that "in this struggle for the perpetuity and extension of democracy, Baptists. . . will be found second to none in loyalty and devotion."[1]

The genuine sense of responsibility for the welfare of the world expressed in these various crusades was obviously deep-seated and widespread. Therefore, Americans were naturally still anxious lest this God-given mission be undermined by the large number of foreigners in the country. Nativistic sentiment did not ride a continuous crest throughout this period, but it ebbed to major proportions two more times.

One of these was in the 1890's. Having begun in the 1880's, it continued to mount in the early 1890's, reaching its crest during the depression of that decade. It was gradually dissipated by the easing of the economic crisis after 1897, the distractions of expansionism, and the reassurances provided by victories in the Spanish-American War.

The economic crises and social discontent which gave rise to this new wave of nativism in the 1880's remained a part of it in the 1890's.

---

[1] Missions, July 1917, p. 535. See also ibid., Sept. 1918, p. 692.

Immigrants were closely related to both problems. Many Americans were convinced that the newcomers were primarily responsible for the conflict between capital and labor, including the large and riotous Homestead, Pennsylvania steel strike in 1892 and the Pullman strike in 1894.[1] Similarly, from the time of the Haymarket Riot of 1886, the new arrivals were persistently stereotyped as lawless creatures, given over to violence and disorder.[2] American Baptists frequently echoed this latter theme. Some of their most prominent spokesmen claimed that multitudes of the immigrants represented the dregs of European society: the lowest and most vicious classes, moral monsters, the destitute, ignorant, illiterate, and degenerate and that they were contributing to pauperism, filth, crime, illiteracy, intemperance, moral degradation, irreligion, anarchy, socialism, and nihilism in America far beyond the proportion of their numbers.[3]

Anti-Catholicism, which had constituted a large part of American nativism earlier in the nineteenth century, was also greatly intensified again.[4] One of the sources of this sentiment was the renewed suspicion that Rome was engaged in a monstrous plot to gain control of America, to subordinate it to Rome, to destroy everything distinctively American, and

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., pp. 68-74; Gossett, op. cit., p. 291f.

[2]Higham, op. cit., pp. 55, 78.

[3]BHMM, Sept. 1891, p. 249; ibid., Sept. 1892, pp. 301-2; ibid., March 1893, pp. 68-9; Examiner, April 25, 1895, p. 12; Home Mission Echoes, April 1898, p. 5.

[4]E.g., Higham, op. cit., pp. 77-81; Wittke, op. cit., pp. 500-06; Davis, op. cit., chapter III; BHMM, Nov. 1893, p. 353; ibid., Aug. 1894, pp. 316-7; ibid., Sept. 1895, pp. 337-43; ibid., June 1896, p. 210.

to remold the country on despotic principles.[1] Therefore, any efforts Catholics made to influence American politics were particularly suspect and created great resentment.[2] Labor problems and strikes were viewed as another form of papal subversion of American institutions, and a "Jesuit plot" was believed to be afoot to capture the American public school system.[3] American Baptists, moreover, became greatly agitated by any moves on the part of the Catholics which appeared to weaken the complete separation of church and state.[4]

In addition, there were now two further sources of nativism. One of them was nationalism. Indeed, one of the leading authorities on American nativism regards nationalism as the "keynote to the whole decade"[5] of the 1890's. When it began to appear from the economic and social unrest and disturbances in the country that patriotism was on a decline, native Americans launched conscious and explicit campaigns to arouse a sense of nationalism, to foster national values, and to create true Americanism or patriotism. In place of a negative and defensive assault on the immigrants, it provided a positive and offensive approach to the problem. Thus, for example, instead of deriding the newcomers for

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., p. 84; BHMM, Jan. 1890, p. 10; ibid., Sept. 1892, p. 302; ibid., May 1896, pp. 158-9; Home Mission Echoes, April 1906, pp. 6-9; Examiner, Aug. 1, 1901, p. 27.

[2]E.g., BHMM, June 1894, pp. 186-7; ibid., Dec. 1894, p. 464; ibid., Jan. 1895, pp. 7-8; ibid., Sept. 1895, pp. 337-43; Examiner, Dec. 9, 1897, pp. 3-4.

[3]E.g., Examiner, Aug. 1, 1901, p. 5.

[4]E.g., BHMM, Sept. 1892, p. 302; Home Mission Echoes, Feb. 1899, p. 12; Examiner, April 18, 1901, pp. 2-3; Davis, op. cit., p. 105.

[5]Higham, op. cit., p. 74.

XUM

their non-conformity or disregard for American values, the nativists could stress the importance of homogeneity for the welfare of a nation.

It was soon discovered, though, that nationalism was a two-edged sword when applied to the immigrants. While it was intented as a positive approach, focusing attention on the importance of maintaining or developing a solid nationalism, it only further highlighted the threat presented by the unassimilated immigrants and increased the resolve of the nativists not to tolerate the frustration of their aspirations for the country, hence contributing to a negative and defensive stance toward the newcomers.[1]

Secondly and similarly, the same Anglo-Saxonism which evoked a high sense of America's mission and destiny naturally also heightened apprehension about anything which might obstruct that mission. Higham maintains that among the populace as a whole Anglo-Saxonism lost its vogue after the Civil War. During the seventies and eighties, it was largely confined to the cultivated classes, and as late as the mid-nineties, it still swayed few outside an eastern elite.[2] While this may be true of the general populace, there are few signs of its waning among Baptists. And while it may be partly true of an interest in identifying and fostering the unique racial characteristics of the Anglo-Saxons, the idea that divine providence had chosen this race for a special mission remained deep-seated among American Baptists. In his study of American Baptist views on immigration, Lawrence B. Davis observed that, contrary to the race ideas of the intellectuals, American Baptists tended to emphasize the

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., pp. 74-7. [2]Ibid., pp. 32, 95-6.

divinely ordained destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race in America and that this version of Anglo-Saxonism remained powerful among them even in the midst of the era of confidence.[1] Some of this has already been seen in their view of the Spanish-American War.[2]

As a consequence, even the safety of American institutions as a whole was again seriously called into question. "There is such a thing as national engorgement, absorbing without assimilating, swallowing without incorporation," noted one observer, and added, "The American organism is beginning to outgrow its period of adolescence, and it is no longer safe to devour everything with its former youthful voracity and indifference to mastication."[3] The ABHMS added:

> Under the influence of this tremendous force of immigrants our Republican institutions are subjected to an enormous strain while our religious life is being slowly but surely and sadly corrupted. Had it not been for the virility of our Western life, the stability of our institutions, the aggressiveness of our Protestant Christianity, we should have been as hopelessly overrun as the Roman Empire was by the hordes that poured down upon it from the North centuries ago.[4]

Under these circumstances, the Americanization and assimilation of the immigrants was again viewed as imperative for survival itself.

What was different about this resurgence of nativism, however, is that German-Americans were no longer considered as one of the major objects of Americanization.[5] In fact, and of great significance for this

---

[1]Davis, op. cit., p. 83, fnt. 16.

[2]See further BHMM, March 1883, pp. 50-1; Examiner, Aug. 22, 1895, p. 9; ibid., Aug. 4, 1898, p. 2; ibid., Sept. 22, 1898, pp. 2-3.

[3]Home Mission Bulletin, April 1901, p. 16.

[4]ABHMS An. Rep., 1900, p. 65. [5]Gossett, op. cit., p. 298.

XUM

study, they were seldom mentioned in American Baptist nativistic articles and books of the period. Only rarely are they singled out for criticism on the charges which had so often been leveled aginst them in the preceding decades. As one of the keener American Baptist observers noted, while there were still unfavorable aspects to the Germans in America, they were "but a small part of the problem of the foreigner in our land."[1] What accounts for this change of perspective?

One of the factors which worked to the advantage of German-Americans was the so-called new immigration. Whereas prior to 1883, 95 per cent of the total immigration came from northern and western Europe,[2] thereafter the proportion from southern and eastern Europe[3] increased to such an extent that from 1883 to 1907 about 81 per cent of the European immigration came from that part of the Occident.[4] The latter is known as the new immigration.

This group was to fall into unusual disfavor in America. Because the shift in immigration occurred gradually, Americans were only vaguely aware of it at first. But during the 1890's the new immigrants were gradually singled out as a separate entity with most undesirable characteristics and the initial distrust of them, "compounded largely out of their

---

[1] BHMM, July 1903, p. 179.

[2] Including Germany, Great Britain, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, France, and Switzerland.

[3] Including the Balkans, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Russia, and Poland.

[4] Mary C. Barnes and Lemuel C. Barnes, The New America: A Study in Immigration (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913), pp. 42-3, 61.

culture and appearance, swelled into a pressing sense of menace, into hatred, and into violence."[1]

One of the first things Americans, including American Baptists, noted about the new immigration was that, as contrasted to the old immigration, it was predominantly Catholic.[2] That was hardly appreciated, to say the least. American Baptists still thought of Catholics not only as non-Christian but as the avowed enemies of Protestantism and America.[3] And judging from the frequent, vitriolic, and unrestrained invectives they levelled against the Catholics, it is clear they were greatly disturbed and resentful of this new development.

Also unfortunate for the new immigrants was the fact that they began to arrive in larger numbers and to become more conspicuous at a time when the country was in the midst of intense economic and social unrest. In addition, they tended to gravitate to the slums, factories, and mines were these problems were most deeply felt. There was also evidence that they were participating in strikes. And as the most impoverished of the immigrants, they either threatened American wage-earners by accepting cut-throat salaries or burdened the taxpayers. Consequently, they came to be identified with the countries social and economic problems and became the scapegoats for many of the nation's frustrations.[4]

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., p. 87.

[2]By 1903 three-fourth of the total immigration to the United States was Catholic and the percentage was continuing to rise.

[3]Examiner, March 21, 1895, p. 9; ibid., Sept. 15, 1898.

[4]BHMM, Aug. 1900, p. 227.

It was also observed and emphasized that the new immigration had a higher rate of illiteracy than the old. Since the most highly cherished of America's institutions, republicanism and evangelical Christianity, both rested on the intelligence of its citizens, and the public school system had been specifically designed to furnish such a citizenry, immigrants who were thought to be too illiterate and prejudiced to know the meaning and responsibilities of democratic institutions and too illiterate and clannish to learn these American values were viewed as a peril to the entire system.[1] As such, they became the objects not only of disrespect but of distrust and resentment.

Many other unfavorable comparisons between the old and new immigration might be cited. Ethnic groups within the new immigration, for instance, tended to segregate themselves more from the rest of American society and were therefore even more slowly assimilated. Since they were thought to be more un-American from the outset, this ethnic cohesiveness was looked upon with unusual disfavor, especially after nationalism and nativism had again risen to a new height. Even their motives for coming to this country were thought to be less worthy than those of their predecessors. In 1903 an American Baptist pastor claimed with an air of certainty that

> many of those who come today are malcontents and ne'er-do-weels, who come here to be free from governmental pressure and to grow rich without hard work. . . . Lured on by false hopes, hating all government and all churches, embittered against society and indifferent to religion, they come here with the avowed purpose of having their own way and of overthrowing all governments. Like the newly arrived son

---

[1] Ibid., May 1903, p. 108; ibid., July 1903, p. 182; Home Mission Echoes, April 1898, pp. 4-5.

of Erin, they are 'forninst the Government' from the very start.[1] In short, the new immigration was viewed in an entirely negative light. It came to represent everything that was wrong with the country.[2]

In contrast, therefore, the old immigration, of which the Germans had constituted a large part, suddenly appeared much more desirable. While not all of the criticisms which had been leveled against it for years were withdrawn, as compared to the new immigration, the Irish now seemed to constitute only an infinitesimal part, and the Germans only a small part, of the immigration problem, and the Scandinavians were judged to make good Americans, a valuable addition to the population.[3]

As regards to the Germans specifically, at least the majority of them were Protestant. Lutheranism was still considered "a mere nominal religion, replete with forms and ceremonies, but sadly lacking in power and vitality,"[4] and many of its adherents joined in the continued German-American opposition to prohibition, Blues Laws, and women's suffrage. But for the American Baptists and for their home mission society which once declared, "If the Society stands for anything, it stands for modern Protestant Christianity and Christian civilization,"[5] nominal Protestants were much to be preferred to Catholics.

Germans were even credited with being an asset to the economy. While most of those arriving during this period were industrial workers

---

[1] BHMM, July 1903, pp. 177-8. [2] Ibid., Aug. 1900, pp. 225, 227.

[3] Ibid., July 1903, p. 179. [4] Ibid.

[5] ABHMS An. Rep., 1898, p. 178.

and artisans, with which the country was generally well-supplied, it was said of them:

> The Germans who come to us as a rule are industrious and energetic people and devote themselves largely to agriculture and the trades. The German immigrant is nearly always a skilled workman, which cannot be said of some other nationalities. Such people make valuable additions to the working force of our population.[1]

Their literacy was also appreciated--perhaps even more than was deserved. For, while universal education had been make available in Germany during the last decades of the nineteenth century, the German immigrants of this period could not match the intellectual and cultural calibre of the Forty-Eighters. Germany's advanced educational system, however, had long been recognized, and as the number of Americans who studied there increased, that appreciation grew. This is perhaps best reflected in the American emulation of German kindergartens and universities.[2] Consequently, some of the intellectual and educational stature which the German immigrants lacked in reality was attributed to them by association.

Much of the same is true of German culture. American esteem of German music, literature, and fine arts was rapidly rising.[3] One indication of this was the growing number of Americans who undertook to learn the language, which opened the door to this culture. At first learning German as a second language was largely confined to professional and cultural circles. The children of Presidents Harrison and Cleveland, for example, were tutored in German. But by the turn of the century, German

---

[1] BHMM, July 1903, p. 179. [2] Faust, op. cit., II, chapter V.

[3] Ibid., chapters VI, VII.

XUM

was becoming a common item on the curricula of institutions of higher education.[1] This development also shed a more favorable light on German immigrants.[2]

German-Americans had gained a special entreé with American Baptists. After all, German Baptists had already defended themselves and their countrymen in the American Baptist press and through able representation in American Baptist associations, state conventions, and national societies for half a century. As has been shown, the promotional task was slow, arduous, and not always successful. However, after the battle over the use of the German language in the early 1880's, American Baptists looked more favorably upon their German mission[3] and even seem to have been convinced that the German churches could be agents of Americanization.[4] As a result, they also further ameliorated their former sentiments toward the immigrants among whom the German churches were working.

Even more decisive was still another consideration. Lawrence B. Davis has argued that American Baptist evaluations of foreign nationalities were based primarily on the latter's responsiveness to the gospel.[5] Baptists, he said, "always began their train of thought with the observation that those who accepted the superior Protestant faith were superior; those who were reluctant or refused the 'gospel' were of a lesser

---

[1] DS, Dec. 18, 1901, p. 792; ibid., Jan. 22, 1902, p. 56.

[2] See also Oscar Handlin, The American People in the Twentieth Century (2nd ed. rev.; Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), pp. 75-6.

[3] BHMM, Nov. 1891, p. 304. [4] Davis, op. cit., p. 148.

[5] Ibid., pp. 120-9, 154-7.

breed."[1] That line of reasoning gave the Germans a considerable edge in the American Baptist rating of immigrant groups. The German Baptist work was the largest of the American Baptist missions to foreign-speaking people, and the parent body was obviously pleased with the German response.[2] General Thomas Morgan, corresponding secretary of the ABHMS and editor of the Baptist Home Mission Monthly went so far as to say, "The rise and progress and wonderful results of the German Baptist mission work in America is one of the marvels of modern missionary history."[3] Accepting the American Baptist correlation between responsiveness to the gospel and racial supremacy, this was saying a mouthful for the German people as a whole.

Admittedly, from about the turn of the century, attitudes toward the new immigration began to be ameliorated and in some respects significantly modified. With the return of economic prosperity after 1897, one of the major sources of nativism was removed. Further fortified by a swift, easy, and psychologically invigorating victory over Spain and the acquisition of an empire, Americans regained a sense of national unity and strength and all but lost their former nativistic fears. Much of their personal repugnance for the foreigners remained, but the fear that the strangers constituted a national peril was greatly diminished. In the flush of these reassurances, nativistic fear of racial pollution was disregarded and confidance again placed in the assimilation capacity

---

[1] Ibid., p. 157.

[2] BHMM, Oct. 1894, p. 412; Examiner, Oct. 31, 1895, p. 21; ABHMS An. Rep., 1903, p. 53.

[3] BHMM, Sept. 1898, p. 297.

of the Anglo-Saxon race. Assimilation was still understood primarily as a fusion of races in an Anglo-Saxon cauldron, but the idea that the immigrants might make contributions to American culture, a cultural accretion process, was gaining ground. As a result, the new immigration was at least tolerated and at times genuinely welcomed, inspite of its growing numbers.[1]

Similar changes were also clearly evident among American Baptists.[2] They did not suddenly disregard the new immigration and entirely shed their nativistic fears. On the contrary, they kept well-posted on the volume of the influx and were very sensitive to the new arrivals' eroding effect on American and institutions. While nativism persisted, however, it was nativism with a difference. As contrasted to the 1890's, it was less negative, alarmist, and deprecating. While it was recognized that the strangers had to be Americanized, there was generally optimism about the outcome of the assimilation process, if American churches fulfulled their function. When attention was drawn to the immigration problem, therefore, it was generally with the positive intent of fostering the kinds of home mission activities which would hasten that process. Secretary H. L. Morehouse captured something of this developing outlook when he described immigration both as "an unequalled opportunity and a tremendous obligation."[3]

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., chapter V.

[2]For a full treatment of the subject see Davis, op. cit., chapter V. References to primary sources would be almost innumerable.

[3]Home Mission Echoes, May 1902, p. 13.

The man most responsible for this change of attitude among the Baptists and probably its best representative was Howard B. Grose, who became editor of the Baptist Home Mission Monthly in 1904 and two years later published the two widely used home mission studies on immigration, Incoming Millions[1] and Aliens or Americans?[2] Rather than simply ignoring the immigration problem, he gave it top priority. But having come to see that the problem was caused more by environmental than racial or national factors, he advised sympathy with and understanding of the new arrivals as fellow human beings. And having regained confidance in the divinely ordained destiny of America and in the assimilative capacity of the Anglo-Saxons, he even questioned the common reference to the newcomers as a "problem," "menace," or "peril," and instead urged personal identification with the immigrant in his problems and progressive social reform to alleviate them. As he stated in the preface to Aliens or Americans?

> Immigration may be regarded as a peril or a providence, an ogre or an obligation--according to the point of view. The Christian ought to see in it the unmistakable hand of God opening wide the door of evangelistic opportunity. Through foreign missions we are sending the gospel to the ends of the earth. As a home mission God is sending the ends of the earth to our shores and very doors. The author is a Christian optimist who believes God has a unique mission for Christian America, and that it will ultimately be fulfilled.[3]

Under the pervasive and powerful influence of Grose and his kind, American Baptists had come a long way by 1914 in replacing their suspicion and hostility for the new immigration with cordiality and concern.

---

[1](New York: Fleming A. Revell Company, 1906).

[2](New York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1906).

[3]Ibid., p. 6.

Some even came to see admirable qualities among the so-called low-grade immigration from southern and eastern Europe, characteristics which they thought should be incorporated into American life rather than being simply replaced with Anglo-Saxon Americanism. New York's two-term Governor Charles E. Hughes, a Baptist and the first president of the Northern Baptist Convention, for example, is credited with having been "one of the early political leaders to praise the foreigners' contribution to America."[1]

If the American Baptist attitude to the new immigration had improved so significantly, why were German-Americans still treated differently? That is, why were the evolving programs of Americanization applied less to them than to the new immigrants? One of the major reasons is that the contrast between the old and new immigration only appears to have been diminished. For while the new immigration was viewed somewhat more favorably, the old immigration and German-Americans in particular, rose sharply in the esteem of American Baptists. On account of further developments in Anglo-Saxon racism in America, German-Americans were even more distinctly set apart from the new immigration than they had been before.

With the development of Anglo-Saxonism from a romantic praise of cultural virtues to a vindictive racism in the late 1890's and the early twentiest century, German-Americans were more closely identified with the Anglo-Saxons and more sharply distinguished from the new immigration.[2]

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., pp. 121-2.

[2]Ibid., chapter VI; Watchman-Examiner, Aug. 17, 1916, p. 106.

XUM

Northern European nationalities had traditionally been thought to share many of the Anglo-Saxon hereditary traits. And since the mid-nineteenth century, the popular teutonic origins theory had drawn further attention to their commonality. But now anthropologists grouped them together as a separate racial entity, the Nordic race, "more or less allied in blood, language, customs, and religion."[1] Being accepted as at least first cousins of the Anglo-Saxons still further enhanced the standing of Germans with Americans. Higham relates that "in 1908 a group of professional people, in rating the traits of various immigrant nationalities, ranked the Germans above the English and in some respects judged them superior to the native whites."[2] Howard B. Grose and Lemuel C. Barnes expressed the dominant sentiment among the American Baptists when they wrote in 1906 and 1913, respectively: "The Germans have always been among the best of our immigration population in intelligence, thrift, and other qualities that make the German nation strong and stable," and "Today no element in our immigration is more highly esteemed than the Germans."[3]

The reverse side of the coin was to accentuate the contrast between the Nordics and other white races, particularly the Latins and the Slavs. Racist nativists concluded that the underlying problem with the

---

[1]BHMM, July 1903, p. 176. Since the term Anglo-Saxon had earlier been understood to refer to English-speaking people only, the terms Nordic and Teutonic were intentionally employed to clarify the broader reference. At other times the former designation was simply broadened to include all the nationalities of northern Europe.

[2]Higham, op. cit., p. 196.

[3]Grose, Aliens or Americans, p. 126 and Barnes, The New America, p. 46. See also DS, May 18, 1910, p. 311.

XUM

new immigration was one of race and hereditary traits.[1] Immigrants from southern and eastern Europe basically clashed with American culture and were perhaps impervious to American civilization, because they were racially wholly different from the dominant Anglo-Saxon native stock and constitutionally incapable of assimilation. So not only were invidious contrasts drawn between the economic, social, political, and religious values of the old and new immigration, but Anglo-Saxons racism was used "to divide the new immigrants from their predecessors in an absolute and fundamental way."[2]

In this way, the old immigration, which formerly was viewed as a threat to American life, was now recognized as most closely akin to the original settlers of the country and racially identified with them, over against the new immigration. Consequently, nativists no longer spoke of safeguarding Anglo-Saxon America against all foreign influence but of preserving the Nordic culture against the invasion of the Latins and Slavs. As nativism again began to mount after 1906 and some began to fear that the dominant and superior culture in America might be fatally infused by the blood of inferior ones, these lines became even more closely drawn. And after President Roosevelt had given wide circulation to the idea that the Anglo-Teutonic people in America were committing racial suicide by reducing their birth rate while the new immigration was continuing their fecundity, Americans often wished that there were even more Germans in the country than there already were. Thus, two prominent American Baptists commented in 1913 that, while Benjamin Franklin had at one time ex-

---

[1]Gossett, op. cit., p. 287. [2]Higham, op. cit., p. 140.

pressed anxiety over the large numbers of Germans coming to Pennsylvania, "at the present time, solicitude in regard to German immigrants is due to the fact that their proportion to our total immigration is less than it was thirty years ago.[1]

These developments profoundly affected the American Baptist mission to German-Americans. For while the ABHMS, together with the other denominational home mission societies, was in the process of developing a more comprehensive program of Americanization, the need to implement it among the new immigration almost entirely overshadowed its importance for German-Americans. References to the latter are conspicuously absent from most of the literature on the subject. Indeed, German-Americans came to be viewed more as fellow Nordics who were partners in the defence of American-Teutonic culture.[2] American Baptists even spoke less of the German work as a mission and more commonly as the German branch of the American Baptist denomination.[3]

World War I, of course, presented a severe test of this new alliance. German-Americans made no secret about their pro-German sympathies during the period of American neutrality. In fact, they loudly, openly, and at times indiscretly rallied to win the American press and American foreign policy to the support of the Fatherland. This ran counter to the pro-Ally leanings of most Americans. But suspicions and tensions really

---

[1]Barnes, The New America, pp. 46-7.

[2]E.g., Verh. (Gen.), 1913, p. 6; DS, Sept. 3, 1913, p. 6.

[3]BHMM, Aug. 1908, p. 315; DS, Feb. 18, 1914, p. 6.

XUM

mounted when the first instances of sabotage by agents operating from the German embassy in Washington became known, some bombing attempts were made against American ships and factories, and the Reich began submarine campaigns which cost some American lives.

> Through popular thinking there spread an image of the German-American community riddled with treason and conspiring under orders from Berlin. . . . Before long public opinion transformed the German-American Alliance into a vast engine of the German government.[1]

Nothing could have been more undesirable. In a country fearing that its population was dangerously diversified for a nation on the verge of war and vigorously engaged in a compaign of 100 per cent conformity and loyalty, disloyalty was the gravest sin. So when American entered the war, Germanophobia quickly leaped to hysteric proportions. Despite the loyalty of all but a few German-Americans, 100 per centers suspected conspiracy everywhere. Even German-American Red Cross volunteers "were widely believed to be putting ground glass in bandages and in food sent out to soldiers." Others were suspected of "selling plaster containing tetanus bacilli, spreading influenza germs, or poisoning well."[2] Many Americans were persuaded the country was unsafe until everything German had been eradicated.

> German music, literature, church services, singing societies, and newspapers, as well as the teaching of German and everything that had even the faintest connection with Germany--including Bismarck herring and sauerkraut--came under the ban.[3]

It was probably the most strenuous nationalism and persistent nativism the country had ever known.[4]

---

[1]Higham, op. cit., p. 197. [2]Ibid., p. 207.

[3]Wittke, op. cit., p. 260. [4]Higham, op. cit., chapter VIII.

Under the circumstances, some racial nativists busied themselves in undoing the racial theories which grouped the Germans with the rest of the Nordics. Some simply distinguished between the hyphenated Teutons and the unhyphenated Anglo-Saxons, while other seceded the Anglo-Saxons from the larger Teutonic race entirely or cut the Germans off from the rest of the Nordics. In any case, the intentions were the same. For in the highly racist thought of the time, German militarism came to be linked to racial characteristics. It was believed that "the Germans were inherently murderous aggressors; the English and Americans had always been defenders of civilization."[1] Consequently, Teuton became a word of contempt rather than a mark of superiority, calling for a clear distinction between the racial character of the German people and that of the English and Americans.

Not everyone, however, subscribed to anti-Germanism or approved of dissociating Germans from the rest of the Nordics. While those who did represented a strongly opinionated segment of the population, their numbers and influence must not be exaggerated. It should be remembered that theories of Teutonic superiority reached their height of influence in America just prior to the war. It was in 1910 and 1912 respectively that Houston Stewart Chamberlain's Foundations of the Nineteenth Century[2] and Count Arthur de Gobineau's Essay on the Inequality of Human Races,[3] two of the most famous and grandiloquent works on German racism, were trans-

---

[1]Gossett, op. cit., p. 341.

[2]Trans. by John Lees (New York: John Lane Company).

[3]Trans. by Adrian Collins (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons).

XUM

lated and published in the United States. And Madison Grant's Passing of the Great Race,[1] probably the most influential book on the subject by an American author, appeared in 1916.[2] Moreover, by the latter date, natural scientists had firmly buttressed the theory of Nordic superiority with new evidence gleaned from eugenics, anthropology, and the Stanford-Binet intelligence tests. Consequently, while popular sentiment and some racial theorists resisted Nordicism,

> many of the patrician intelligentsia of the East remained faithful to the Anglo-Saxon tradition, which at least ministered to their strong pro-British sympathies. Among them, the scientific race-thinkers pursued their inquiries uninterruptedly. . . . Madison Grant's book appeared in 1916 with only a casual reference to the war as another deplorable example of an old suicidal blood rage among the Nordics.[3]

Even the public reaction to Germans in America stemmed more from a fear of their possible disloyalty and threat to the safety of the country, than from a dislike of specific German cultural traits. Both Presidents Roosevelt and Wilson, who set the tune for the new nationalism and 100 per cent Americanism, for example, directed their attacks primarily against the hyphenated American of divided loyalty and not against Germans as such.[4] Hence, while Teutonism was given a severe setback by the war, it was not crushed entirely.[5]

Furthermore, the Germanophobia and anti-Teutonism was short-lived.

---

[1](New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Ltd.).

[2]Higham, op. cit., p. 155. It is true that Grant tried to dispose of the German claim to Nordic stock, but his bias did not extend to Americans of German descent (Gossett, op. cit., p. 361).

[3]Higham, op. cit., p. 201. [4]Ibid., pp. 198-9.

[5]Gossett, op. cit., chapter XIV; Higham, op. cit., pp. 149-57.

XUM

Although intense while they lasted, they were soon replaced by the Big Red Scare. Fervent nationalism and Americanism continued after the war, but the immigrants from eastern Europe now succeeded the Germans as the new scapegoats for the xenophobes in these movements. In fact, so complete was the transition that Nordic racism was soon revived by the racial theorists and in a relatively short time German-Americans regained both their self-respect and the respect of their fellow Americans.[1]

Where did American Baptists stand on these issues? Did the war also reverse their attitudes to German-Americans and cause them to revert to a program of Americanization in their mission to these people? Surprisely it did not. With astonishing persistence they held to their pre-war attitude toward new Americans, including the Germans.[2] Naturally, many of the rank and file were swept along by the widespread anti-Germanism of the war years. The major denominational periodicals and official organizations, however, determinately resisted it.

The stance taken by the Watchman-Examiner, the denomination's leading newspaper, was particularly interesting. Although determined to observe the strictest neutrality, it frequently defended Germany, German-Americans, and German Baptists against unfair attacks in an effort to prevent, or at least minimize, racial strife.[3] Thus, even after it had become fashionable to charge the war to German militarism, the paper

---

[1]Gossett, op. cit., chapter XV; Higham, op. cit., pp. 222-3; Wittke, op. cit., p. 260.

[2]Davis, op. cit., chapter VI.

[3]Watchman-Examiner, Jan. 14, 1915, p. 38.

commented:

> It must not be forgotton that, if Germany had the greatest army in the world, Great Britain insisted on maintaining a navy equal to the combined navies of any two other nations. We are aware of the strong arguments that unhold the claims of France on Alsace and Lorraine; but if France had not maintained those claims she would not have been attacked by Germany. Much can also be said for Russia's championship of the smaller Slav States; but it was just that which brought Germany to declare war on Russia.[1]

Although disturbed by Germany's sinking of the Lusitania and disappointed with the Kaiser's reply to President Wilson's demand for reparations, it still maintained, "Our people do not desire war or non-intercourse with Germany. For the German people our people have only love and admiration."[2]

Comments like these apparently raised some questions about the paper's sympathies, whereupon it reasserted its neutrality,[3] but proceeded to defend Germany's position on the rights of neutrals on the high sea[4] and showed more amazement and admiration than resentment over that country's world diplomacy and espionage.[5] Even after more German-Americans were discovered to have been involved in scandalous intrigues against the United States and the country was on the verge of war, the Watchman-Examiner maintained it was Germany that was misleading German-Americans and reasserted:

> We believe profoundly that the great mass of our German citizens are as loyal to our country as are our citizens who have come from any of the warring nations. Let the evil or misguided men among our German population who have lent themselves to German intrigues be hunted down and punished, but let not the fact of treachery and the presence of these traitors among us prejudice those of us with

---

[1] Ibid., Jan. 7, 1915, pp. 6-7. [2] Ibid., June 3, 1915, p. 685.

[3] Ibid., Aug. 12, 1915, p. 1033. [4] Ibid., Sept. 2, 1915, p. 1125.

[5] Ibid., Oct. 28, 1915, p. 1381.

> English blood in our veins against our fellow-citizens with German blood in their veins. . . . In case of war of course we shall find treachery, but the rank and file of German people in the United States have cast in their lot with us for all the future, and they may be depended upon to defend their adopted country.[1]

In a similar vein, it recognized the difficulty of Anglo-Saxons and Teutons resisting distrust, suspicion and hatred and of living in "perfect fellowship and amity" after March of 1917 but pleaded with its readers to deepen "'the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'"[2]

Nor did it desert the German-Americans after the United States entered the war. It stood with the Northern Baptist Convention's resolution to support the president in the war effort. But retaining Wilson's distinction between the German people and their leaders, it insisted:

> We have no quarrel with the German people as a people. On the contrary many of us admire them and have only the friendliest feelings toward them. We are not fighting them, but the Prussian militarism, the autocratic despotism, that is back of them and that is using them for its purposes. They are only the pawns in the great game that is being played to a finish between democracy and autocracy, between free institutions and medieval reactionism. That most of them are willing pawns, believing in the cause to which they are committed, is only what is to be expected, and does not alter the situation in the least.[3]

Recognizing that some people would not be able to make that distinction, it reminded them, and pulpiteers in particular, of Christ's admonition to love our enemies.[4] Similarly, it called for a distinction between the traitors of German blood and the rest of their countrymen in America. It backed firm treatment of the former, but still claimed, "We have no

---

[1] Ibid., March 15, 1917, p. 327. [2] Ibid., March 29, 1917, p. 391.

[3] Ibid., April 12, 1917, p. 454. See also ibid., May 10, 1917, p. 602.

[4] Ibid., April 26, 1917, p. 527.

nobler body of citizens than our German-American citizens. Beyond all doubt nine-tenths of them are loyal to America."[1] And as late as April of 1918, when fear of disloyalty was whelming into hysteria, it denounced the lynching of a German-American in Collinsville, Illinois as "an unspeakable detestable crime" and again warned:

> In the present crisis we must be more than careful that we do no injustice to our loyal and patriotic citizens of German birth or German parentage.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It goes without saying that we have no sympathy with the disloyal elements in our heterogeneous population, but we feel that it will be to our everlasting shame if in this day we so far forget ourselves as to suspect men of disloyalty simply because they were born in Germany or were born here of German parents. Such an attitude is un-American, un-democratic and un-Christian. We must not humiliate and embitter our loyal fellow citizens who happen to have German blood in their veins.[2]

The Watchman-Examiner had also sympathized with fellow Baptists in Germany and Austria, convinced that they, like Americans, must be opposed to "the action of their imperial rulers and dominant militarists."[3] When therefore late in the war the editors of the paper received correspondence from some Baptist leaders in Germany denying that the German government's war policy was in any way opposed to the will of the people and even supporting its actions in Belgium, they were greatly disillusioned.[4] Thereafter, the distinction between the German people and their government began to fade, and the paper published some articles openly critical of Germany. It, however, still rejected vendetta against the

---

[1] Ibid., Nov. 29, 1917, p. 1529. [2] Ibid., April 18, 1918, p. 493.

[3] Ibid., Jan. 14, 1915, pp. 43-4. See also ibid., Jan. 25, 1915, p. 118; ibid., Oct. 4, 1917, p. 1277.

[4] Ibid., June 20, 1918, p. 786.

Germans as such.

Missions, the official organ of the major denominational societies, undoubtedly shared the same perspective. As the primary promotional paper of these societies, it could not afford to alienate even the smallest minority and therefore remained discretly silent about the Germans. But, as we have seen, prior to the war its editor, Howard B. Grose, was the denomination's leading advocate of fraternalism with the New Americans, and as late as March of 1918 his paper still blamed the war on the "rulers of Germany," suggesting a position very much like that of the Watchman-Examiner.[1] Some lesser denominational papers[2] reflected the anti-Germanism at large, but Missions better represented the official position of the denomination.[3] The ABHMS even avowed, rather than being alienated from the Germans, "the heartaches which we have all had over the difficulties between the nations have drawn us and our German Brethren together with ever increasing love and sympathy."[4]

Accordingly, American Baptists did not revert to an emphasis on Americanizing German-Americans. Even during the war, leaders of the Northern Baptist Convention thought of Germans in America more as fellow Teutons than as aliens who needed to be Americanized.[5] As late as July

---

[1]Missions, March 1918, p. 198. See also ibid., Feb. 1915, pp. 164-5; ibid., July 1917, p. 515.

[2]Particularly the Journal and Messenger, published in Cincinnati.

[3]DS, May 30, 1917, p. 7; ibid., May 11, 1918, p. 7.

[4]ABHMS An. Rep., 1920, p. 15.

[5]In any case, they emphatically repudiated the type of coercive

of 1916 the Watchman-Examiner printed an article which noted that "American civilization has been built on Teutonic foundations--English, German, Dutch and Scandinavian,"[1] and only about a month after the war had ended another one which reminded those who had been calling the Germans all sorts of uncomplimentary names that "the composite American came from about the same stock as the Germans,"[2] but none as much as suggested the Americanization of German-Americans.

Interestingly, an entire year after the War, Charles A. Brooks of the Home Mission Society advised:

> We have need to evaluate afresh the methods and policy which make it possible for groups of Baptists after fifty years of life in America, aided by the missionary funds of the denomination, to maintain separate and distinct consciousness and persistently refuse to identify themselves with all the denominational interest.[3]

That was an obvious reference to the German Baptists. But it was too late for such action, even if the Society had decided to pursue it. By the next year the German Baptists had achieved financial independence from the ABHMS and had become fully independent in the area of home missions.

Americanization attempted by some state and federal organizations (Davis, op. cit., pp. 258-74).

[1] Watchman-Examiner, July 13, 1916, p. 895.

[2] Ibid., Dec. 26, 1918, p. 1591. [3] ABHMS An. Rep., 1919, p. 48.

CHAPTER 8

PARTNERS IN MISSIONS

In what ways were the American Baptists' new atitudes toward German-Americans and the changes in their motivation for ministering to these immigrants to affect the nature of the mission? That is, how were they to affect the operational procedures of the mission and the expectations placed upon the German Baptists? These are the kinds of questions to which we will now turn.

Since the major and most tangible tie between American Baptists and their German mission was financial, changes in their relationship are most noticable in the financial arrangements between them. In every area these followed a pattern of reduced American Baptist assistance and increased self-sufficiency on the part of the German Baptists.

This transition, however, was only gradual. Although American Baptists accepted German-Americans as fellow Nordics and defenders of Anglo-Teutonic culture fairly early in this period, German Baptists were not yet in a financial position to assume the responsibilities of becoming full partners in the evangelization and Americanization of New Americans. In fact, they themselves still needed some assistance. They were still unable to absorb the entire cost of the various enterprises they had undertaken with the aid of their English-speaking brethren. Nevertheless, they progressively assumed a larger share of their total budget,

so that by 1920 they were not only paying nearly all of their own expenses but were already contributing substantially to home and foreign mission work among other nationalities.

This pattern can be most clearly seen in the area of home missions. As previously, the German mission received the largest amount of aid for home mission purposes. From the number of missionaries and evangelists assisted, it may even appear as though the mission was receiving more than before. From 1893 to 1901 the ABHMS helped to support an average of sixty-seven such workers annually as compared to fifty-five from 1879 to 1892. And from 1901 to 1910 it aided an all-time high of eighty-two a year. Thereafter, however, the number dropped sharply to forty-nine for the fiscal year 1913-1914 and thirty-five for the year 1919-1920.[1]

A tabulation of the number of missionaries employed in and of itself is misleading. Rather than giving the German mission more, the ABHMS was gradually reducing its support. As in the previous period, it matched the contributions of the German churches up to a set limit. But now it gradually lowered that ceiling. At the beginning of this period, the ceiling was set at $8,250, or $16,500 when doubled. Because of a considerable deficit in its own budget in 1894, however, the Home Mission Society cut that figure back to $7,500.[2] In spite of growing needs and repeated requests for more by the German Baptists, it refused to exceed that limit till 1904, when it agreed to an increase of $500 a

---

[1]Interestingly, dropping many times more rapidly from 1910 to 1914 than during the war years (ABHMS An. Reps., 1893-1920).

[2]DS, June 27, 1894, p. 4; BHMM, Sept. 1894, p. 373.

XUM

year.[1] Howbeit, within three years and another debt, it again felt compelled to reduce the ceiling by ten per cent.[2] Thereafter the limit continued to drop, falling to $7,000 in 1909, $6,000 in 1912, $5,000 in 1919, and $4,383 in 1920.

As the ABHMS reduced its support of the mission, the German churches increased theirs. Believing that the urgency of their work would not justify retrenchment, they were compelled to give more simply to compensate for the Home Mission Society's cutbacks. This they did. As early as 1895 they had surpassed American Baptists in per capita giving.[3] Nor were they to stop there. In an effort to meet the new opportunities that constantly kept arising, they almost doubled their home mission budget during this period and, in addition, raised an $120,000 endowment. Thus, by 1920 they were sustaining almost four-fifths of their total home mission budget. From there it was only a small step to full financial independence, which they declared in that same year.

The same pattern developed in the financing of German Baptist church buildings. During the early years of this period, the Church Edifice Department of the ABHMS continued to add two dollars to every one contributed by the German churches for the purpose of assisting sister congregations in erecting houses of worship. Finding itself in debt and with growing demands on its funds from English-speaking churches by the

---

[1] DS, June 21, 1899, p. 388; Verh. (Gen.), 1901, p. 11; ibid., 1904; 4th App., p. 10.

[2] Verh. (Gen.), 1907, 5th App., p. VII.

[3] Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 12; BHMM, June 1901, p. 175.

end of the 1890's, it required the German churches to raise half of some requests for aid rather than only a third and sent them notice that some changes of policy would be necessary.[1] After some deliberations, it continued to triple contributions from German churches as a rule, but retained the prerogative to act on each application for assistance separately and to respond only as the need seemed to justify and its own resources permitted. But in 1908 it gave notice that it would only double rather than triple contributions from German churches and only to a ceiling of $1,500.[2] And by the next year it began lowering that ceiling. In 1909 it was dropped to $1,200, by 1912 to $600, and by 1913 to $400. Thereafter, the long-standing financial arrangement with the German churches was fully terminated.[3]

Finding that requests for grants and loans from German churches exceeded the Church Edifice Department's willingness to pay, the General Missionary Society of the German churches began to make some funds available to its needy congregations over and above those which were funnelled through the ABHMS.[4] That amount also rapidly increased, so that in the three years from 1898 to 1901 it assisted more churches directly than through the Church Edifice Department.[5] By 1907 it not only aided more churches this way but also paid out a larger amount. By the next year

---

[1] DS, Jan. 17, 1900, p. 37.

[2] Ibid., April 28, 1909, p. 6; ABHMS An. Rep., 1909, p. 107.

[3] Verh. (Gen.), 1910, 1st App., p. V; DS, April 27, 1910, p. 10; ibid., May 8, 1912, pp. 7, 10; ibid., May 7, 1913, p. 9.

[4] Verh. (Gen.), 1895, App., p. XXV. [5] Ibid., 1901, 1st App., p. VI.

it paid out more than twice as much and by 1913 the entire amount.[1]

As in the previous periods, the German mission also received some financial assistance directly from American Baptist churches, associations, and state conventions.[2] In addition, the emerging American Baptist City mission societies accepted some responsibility for missions to foreign-speaking people in their jurisdiction, occasionally including the Germans.[3] Because the German Baptists, unlike the other foreign-speaking Baptists, had primary ties with the ABHMS rather than to local and state organizations, however, they received only limited aid from these sources. And by 1910 even that had dwindled to a trickle.

The German Department of Rochester Theological Seminary was also in the process of becoming self-supporting. At the beginning of this period it was still receiving considerable American Baptist support. After terminating its financial assistance to students in the German Department in 1893, the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education was still paying the larger portion of the professors' salaries in that department. Facing a deficit the following year, President Augustus H. Strong felt obligated "to throw upon the German churches the responsibility of providing for the entire support of the German professors" as well or to secure an endowment of $100,000.[4] Fortunately for the German

---

[1] DS, April 17, 1907, p. 10; ibid., May 6, 1908, p. 6.

[2] E.g., ibid., May 13, 1896, p. 2; ibid., June 9, 1897, p. 2.

[3] E.g., Verh. (JK), 1897, p. 9; DS, June 21, 1899, p. 387; Verh. (Gen.), 1901, 1st App., p. V.

[4] NYBUME An. Rep., 1894, p. 27.

churches, John D. Rockefeller again saved the day in the way that he was most able. The next year Strong again requested that the German churches support their own professors, but in response to their pleading he granted them a period of grace in which to raise the endowment.[1] Meanwhile, the Union grudging continued to keep the German professors from starvation.[2]

The German Department was nevertheless making definite progress toward self-sufficiency, though the pace expected by the Union was difficult at first, considering the limited means of the supporting churches. Assuming the full expense of student assistance in 1893 was already a giant step for the Department. The prospect of having to absorb the professors' salaries only one year later, therefore, caused its leaders no end of anxiety. Perhaps, they projected, the school would even have to be closed. As Walter Rauschenbusch described the situation in his picturesque style:

> It is like a fast American liner trying to cross the Atlantic on time, but held back by having a German craft in tow which is able to run at half speed only. Very reluctantly, they assure us, the trustees of the seminary have come to the conclusion that they must cut the cable and let the slower vessel plod its way alone. And now--to keep up the figure--the officers on board the latter are considering whether, in view of the long trip and the short rations, they had not better throw half the passengers and part of the crew overboard. How can an institution costing $11,000 per annum be run on a funded income of $2,100 and annual contributions of $3,000? The German churches, with their usual fidelity, have in this past year of depression increased their contributions to $4,345.24, but there is a point beyond which even their willingness will not stretch.[3]

Yet, somewhat to their own surprise, the German churches managed to raise

---

[1] Ibid., 1895, p. 38; Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 21; DS, May 22, 1901, p. 330.

[2] NYBUME An. Rep., 1896, pp. 20, 28. [3] Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 13.

sufficient funds for student assistance that year and most of the following years. Over and above that, they contributed more than $40,000 to the endowment.

As the endowment grew the German Department became increasingly independent from the New York Baptist Union but continued to draw on American Baptist churches. As a matter of fact, it was expected and hoped that independence from the Union would free it to solicit funds more widely among American Baptists.[1] As a state organization the Union was allowed to appeal for support only in a restricted geographical area. Since the Germans had only one school and their students were coming and returning to more than twenty states, they were also free to solicit funds in the broader community. And this they did for several more years.

As a result, $57,108 of the $100,000 endowment were collected from American Baptist donors.[2] Several Baptist state educational societies also continued to assist the Department.[3] When most of the endowment had been collected, however, this source of income also diminished sharply.[4] Consequently, by 1920 the German Department had to support itself, with the exception of only occasional supplements from the New York Baptist Union.[5]

---

[1] NYBUME An. Rep., 1894, p. 20; Examiner, Oct. 31, 1895, p. 21.

[2] Verh. (Gen.), 1913, p. 33.

[3] Ibid., 1895, App. VII-VIII; ibid., 1898, 6th App., p. III.

[4] Ibid., 1904, 3rd App., p. 6; ibid., 1907, 4th App., pp. I, III-IV.

[5] Ibid., 1919, p. 23.

As the German Baptists achieved more financial independence, they became less of a needy partner to the American Baptists and more of a helpful co-laborer. By the mere fact that they were ministering to German-Americans, they were rendering valuable assistance to American Baptists in the evangelization of foreign-speaking people, because the latter had known for many years and still acknowledged that missions among these people was best conducted in their own language. But now the German Baptists were to go even further. Fulfilling the American Baptists expectations of them, they ministered not only to their own people but joined their Anglo-Saxon cousins in the evangelization and Americanization of the new immigration.

Admittedly, they were reluctant at first to accept the responsibilities of partnership, at least in the form of contributing financially to the American Baptist missions among other foreign-speaking peoples. When in 1891 Dr. H. L. Morehouse, the corresponding secretary of the ABHMS, pointedly prodded the Eastern Conference of the German Baptists to enlarge its missionary vision "to active participation in all the evangelizing movements of the denomination in our own land,"[1] it recommended to its churches to receive an annual offering for the general work of that society.[2] But, despite repeated reminders, little was done during the following decade. One pastor--not of the Eastern Conference--left the Society two thousand dollars in his will, but only one or more churches honored the Conference's recommendation.[3] As a matter of fact,

---

[1] BHMM, Nov. 1891, p. 305. [2] Ibid., p. 298.

[3] DS, March 18, 1896, p. 4; Verh. (Gen.), 1901, 1st App., p. VII.

when Dr. Morehouse's successor and the district secretaries of the ABHMS, who were also its solicitors, began applying more pressure at about the turn of the century,[1] some German pastors, including the former General Missionary Secretary of the German churches, asserted that the work among German-Americans was their primary responsibility and advised that, if the German churches were placed under an obligation to assist substantially in the other areas of the Home Mission Society's work, they should consider parting ways with the American Baptist society.[2]

More sensitive to the American Baptist perspective, Rev. George A. Schulte, the General Missionary Secretary, pointed out that the Home Mission Society had a legitimate right to solicit funds among all Baptist churches and was doing a tremendous work, to which the Germans should be proud to contribute.[3] Rev. Edward Anschütz, another influential pastor, added that severing relations with the ABHMS was not at all financially advisable at that time. Indeed, in view of the continued expansion of the German work in the West, the Home Mission Society should be asked instaad to increase its support from year to year.[4] Following the advice of the latter, the General Conference of the German Baptists voted later that year to extend the recommendation of the Eastern Conference to the entire German Baptist constituency, that is to ask all the churches to collect at least one offering a year for the ABHMS.[5]

---

[1] DS, Jan. 23, 1901, p. 57.

[2] Ibid., p. 56; ibid., Feb. 13, 1901, p. 105. An indication that ties were being maintained primarily for financial reasons.

[3] DS, Jan. 23, 1901, p. 57. [4] Ibid., Feb. 27, 1901, p. 137.

[5] BHMM, Feb. 1902, p. 32.

XUM

But this recommendation, too, was largely disregarded. The German churches still rarely contributed to the larger work of the Home Mission Society.[1] It was to take actual involvement in the mission to other nationalities to stimulate their interest and to elicit their financial support.

Such involvement had already begun. Baptists in Germany had been instrumental in starting Baptist churches in several neighboring countries and maintained some contact with them in subsequent years. When Baptists from those countries immigrated to the United States, therefore, it was natural for them to seek out a German Baptist church where possible. Many of them also had at least a limited knowledge of German or could easily find an interpreter. The German churches, for their part, welcomed the newcomers, started separate mission stations among them, and helped them establish their own churches where their numbers and leadership permitted--very much like American Baptists had leavened and assisted the first German churches in the country. In this way the First German Baptist Church of Buffalo gave rise to the first Polish Baptist church of America in 1894 and the First German Baptist Church of Chicago to the first Bohemian Baptist church in America in 1896. Thus, even before the turn of the century, it was not uncommon to find several nationalities represented in the German churches, among which were Poles, Bohemians, Russians, Hungarians, Romanians, Lettonians, Livonians, Slavonians, and Croatians.[2]

As early as 1898, a perceptive pastor observed that "the German

---

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1903, p. 32. [2] E.g., BHMM, Sept. 1898, pp. 314-5.

XUM

Baptists are best fitted and equipped for this work by contact and language." Indeed, "God has sent these nationalities here, and from our hands will their blood be required."[1] This conviction continued to grow,[2] and the number of missions multipled.[3] Particularly noteworthy was the outreach of the First German Baptist Church of Pittsburgh. Under the aggressive leadership of Rev. Henry C. Gleiss, who was later elected head of the Northern Baptist Convention's Committee on City Missions, this church alone conducted mission work among Italians, Russians, Poles, Croatians, Bohemians, and Lithuanians in Pittsburgh and vicinity.[4]

Yet one receives the impression that the German churches as a whole were still doing less than their best in home missions to other nationalities. After leaning on the arm of the ABHMS for so many years, they tended to view this responsibility as falling primarily on the parent organization. Was their own mission not principally to the German-Americans, which in itself still required more men and financial resources than they could muster? The return to confidance during the early years of this century probably also tended to minimize the urgency of the task. Thus, at least efforts to assist the ABHMS were made more to retain its favor and support than out of a sense of genuine concern for the task at hand.[5]

---

[1]Ibid., Sept. 1898, p. 315. [2]DS, April 15, 1903, p. 232.

[3]E.g., Verh. (Gen.), 1907, 5th App., p. III.

[4]Bertha Grimmell Judd, Fifty Golden Years: The First Half Century of the Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1877-1927 (New York: The Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1927), pp. 44-5; Davis, op. cit., pp. 166-8.

[5]BHMM, Feb. 1902, p. 32; ABHMS An. Rep., 1909, p. 107.

Time and experience, however, demonstrated that the newcomers were definitely more inclined to associate themselves with the German churches than with the English ones. They were usually better acquainted with the German language, felt a closer affinity to fellow immigrants, shared a similar religious background, and developed a similar view of the Christian life after their conversion.[1] As late as 1909 most of the Baptist missions among the new immigration in the larger cities had their origin in connection with German churches and were under their fostering care for some years.[2] Consequently, the conviction that God had indeed given German Baptists a special responsibility to these people grew and became more widespread; German churches also took growing pride in their achievements in this area.

After having become personally involved and interested in this phase of the home mission enterprise, they now also agreed to help support the corresponding efforts of the ABHMS. In 1912 their General Missionary Society voted to give one thousand dollars a year to the English society, and the next year their General Conference increased that amount to ten per cent of the designated home mission contributions of its churches.[3] Its action was motivated partly out of appreciation for the "sympathetic interest," "cordial good-will," and "noble generosity" which the ABHMS had shown to the German work for so many years, but also out of a "desire to assure the Society of our sympathetic interest in its

---

[1] DS, May 8, 1912, pp. 12-3. [2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1909, p. 107.

[3] DS, May 8, 1912, p. 7; ibid., Oct. 29, 1913, p. 5; ABHMS An. 1914, p. 28.

efforts to solve the new problems which now confront our country and churches." More specifically, they added:

> We covet a share in the work of the evangelization of the multitudes of strangers within our gates. We are not unconscious of the fact, that God has been providentially leading us out into a larger work and that the German language offers peculiar advantages in the evangelistic approach to many of these people. God has already used us in laying foundations, upon which our American brethren are building.[1]

Because of the large claims being made on its treasury, the General Missionary Society cut back its support to $2,500 in 1920, but, even after terminating its long-standing financial arrangement with the ABHMS, it promised to continue contributions to that society as large as its resources would permit.[2]

In addition to the German churches' general participation in and support of ministries to other nationalities, the women of these churches, for several years, gave virtually all of their income for home missions to the Woman's Baptist Home Mission Society. In as much as this society was engaged in missions to foreign-speaking people, the former were also contributing to the cause. Until the turn of the century, these contributions averaged less than one thousand dollars a year, but during the first decade of this century, the amount was roughly doubled.[3] Thereafter, however, a growing percentage of it was diverted into independent German Baptist benevolent enterprises, so that the portion sent to the American Baptist society gradually dwindled.[4]

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1913, p. 17. See also DS, April 29, 1914, p. 11.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1920, p. 14.

[3] E.g., Verh. (Gen.), 1904, 4th App., p. 7. [4] Ibid., 1916, p. 35.

XUM

Perhaps more significant than these financial contributions, therefore, were the home missionary personnel provided by the German Baptist ladies. By 1900 fifty-four had graduated from the missionary training school of the WBHMS,[1] and from then until World War I there were usually about two dozen of them in the employment of the American Baptist society.[2] Most of them served as assistants in German Baptist churches but also frequently did pioneer work among women and children of other nationalities. This included home visitation, the distribution of Bibles and other Christian literature, Sunday schools, Christian centers, sewing schools, and the like.

In many cases German Baptist missions to other nationalities were greatly benefited by the work of these lady missionaries. Miss Gesina Meier, for instance, opened a sewing school among the Bohemians in Chicago soon after the mission was begun. The school started with forty girls, soon increased to three times that number, and undoubtedly contributed to the founding of the First Bohemian church.[3] The new congregation had two hundred pupils enrolled in its Sunday school.

German Baptists were also to prove themselves valuable partners in the training of leadership for the young churches among the new immigration. Leadership was urgently needed in these churches. Since

---

[1]Examiner, May 30, 1901, p. 3.

[2]Which was named the Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society (WABHMS) after the merger of the WBHMS of Chicago and the WABHMS of Boston in 1909. DS, May 25, 1898, p. 325, Verh. (Gen.), 1901, 1st App., pp. V-VI; DS, May 30, 1906, p. 345; Missions, July 1912, p. 563.

[3]Judd, op. cit., pp. 42-5.

Baptists had not been very successful in the countries from which the new immigration was coming, the work was new among these people and its leaders had to be recruited and trained in America. And since most of the candidates for the ministry in these circles found it easier to undertake academic training in German than in English, they began coming to the German Department of Rochester Theological Seminary. Beginning with one Polish and two Russian students in 1899,[1] the number slowly grew, reaching a height of about twenty just prior to World War I.[2]

This was a valuable contribution to home missions among the new immigration. While it is true that the Germans received some financial assistance from American Baptists for the training of non-German students, that the War disrupted this training program at the German Department, and that after 1920 most non-German students were recruited by a new multi-lingual seminary founded by the American Baptists, the German Baptists' part in the mission to these people must not be underestimated. It was they, after all, who trained most of the first and many of the most prominent leaders of these foreign-speaking Baptist bodies.

American Baptists had always regarded missionary activity in Europe as a foreign arm of their home mission work among European nationalities. Some of those who were won to the faith abroad naturally migrated to America. Having already become Baptists, they were more easily assimilated into American Baptist churches. Since American Bap-

---

[1] NYBUME An. Rep., 1900, p. 21.

[2] In 1910, for example, there were six Hungarians, seven Lithuanians, four Bohemians and Slovaks, and one Pole (Kuhn, op. cit., p. 85).

XUM

tists closely identified Americanism and Protestantism, they expected that Baptist immigrants would also be more easily Americanized. From that perspective, German Baptists could be said to have made still a further contribution to the evangelization and Americanization of the new immigration.

Finding themselves in a better financial condition than their co-religionists in Europe and anxious to be engaged in some form of foreign missions, they began in 1883 to assist Baptists on the European continent by the usual means of supporting missionary pastors, helping to finance new church buildings, and so forth.[1] By the beginning of the period under study, they were helping to support five missionaries with nearly eleven hundred dollars,[2] plus church edifice funds which varied considerably from year to year. By 1909 that number had increased to eleven and the amount of support to fifteen hundred dollars.[3] Then within one year the number of missionaries jumped to twenty-eight and remained around thirty per year until the War.[4] During the fiscal year 1913-1914, for instance, they helped to support thirteen missionary pastors in Russia, six in Germany, one in Switzerland, four in Austria-Hungary and Galacia, five in Rumania, and one in Bulgaria.[5] To do so was costing up to twelve thousand dollars a year. In addition, in the three years from 1913 to 1916 alone, they contributed over nineteen thousand dollars to the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society (ABFMS), designated for

---

[1] Verh. (E), 1883, p. 10. [2] DS, Jan. 30, 1895, p. 5.

[3] Ibid., April 28, 1909, p. 7. [4] Ibid., April 27, 1910, p. 10.

[5] Ibid., April 29, 1914, p. 8.

European missions.[1]

Severed communications with most European countries during the War forced this work to be almost entirely suspended.[2] Soon after the War, however, new appeals for aid and the beckoning of new and promising opportunities, combined with a strong sense of responsibility and sympathy, resulted in the mission being renewed and more than doubled. By 1922, the German Baptists were supporting, in part or in full, seventy-seven missionaries and colporteurs in Europe.[3] In addition, nineteen hundred dollars were sent to Austria alone for church construction.

The personal investigation of a commission from among their ranks convinced the General Missionary Society of the German Baptists that the mission should be aggressively pursued, because the Baptists in the countries concerned could not manage without outside aid, no other Baptist mission society was taking an interest in these people, God appeared to have called and prepared the German Baptists for this particular task, and the work was bearing satisfying results.[4] By 1928 the enterprise began to wane slightly, because some missionaries were forced out of Siberia and the improved economies of the other countries made more self-sufficiency possible. During the 1930's the depression forced still further cutbacks.[5] But as late as 1940, after Baptists in Germany had

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1916, p. 36. [2] Ibid., 1919, pp. 8-9.

[3] One in Estonia, ten in Germany, eight in Switzerland, one in Hungary, nine in Rumania, twelve in Bulgaria, twenty-four in Poland, and twelve in Siberia (Ibid., 1922, pp. 24-5).

[4] Ibid., 1922, pp. 24-6. [5] Ibid., 1934, p. 30.

XUM

assumed the work in Austria and Czechoslovakia and parts of Poland had been absorbed by Russia, German Baptists in America were wtill aiding thirty-eight missionaries in Bulgaria, Hungary, Jugoslavia, and Rumania with approximately eleven thousand dollars annually.[1]

Thus, the once reluctant co-laborer in the evangelization and Americanization of the new immigration had risen to the rank of a full-fledged and aggressive partner. All of these efforts may still appear insignificant as compared to those of the American Baptists. The ABHMS alone employed up to 377 missionaries among twenty-six nationalities.[2] These figures alone, however, are misleading. Because of the German Baptists' better entreé with the new immigration and their better understanding of the latter's cultural shock in immigrating to America, the significance of their contribution is far out of proportion to the number of missionaries they helped to train or support. The official centennial history of the ABHMS records, "In large measure the results achieved among the Bohemians, Poles, Slavonians, Hungarian, and Slavs were due to the missionary spirit among the German ministers." And following some illustrations of their contributions and author concluded, "The Germans thus became the Society's leading agent in giving the gospel to other national groups in America."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., 1940, p. 41.

[2] ABHMS An. Rep., 1917, p. 20; Missions, June 1917, pp. 464-5.

[3] White, op. cit., p. 134.

CHAPTER 9

AMERICANIZED BUT NOT ASSIMILATED

The ultimate objective of the mission to German-Americans, however, was to fully assimilate the Germans into American Baptists churches, In this the latter were to be largely disappointed. Individual members and entire German Baptists churches transferred their alliance, but the mission as such did not. Paradoxically, even though its members were rapidly becoming Americanized--which American Baptists had always assumed would result in their full assimilation--they drifted still further away from the parent body, institutionally. By 1920 they had in effect become an independent denomination. Thereafter, there was still a possibility of eventual assimilation into the Northern Baptist Convention, but in 1940 they chose instead to remain separate.

There should be no mistaking of the American Baptists' intentions for the mission. In 1913 the ABHMS reaffirmed that its policy concerning the relationship between American and foreign-speaking Baptist churches had always been that which was established in 1850. That is, the organization of separate foreign-speaking churches, associations, conventions, conferences, and other organizations was to be permitted as a temporary expediency for reaching newcomers. But they were to be dissolved as soon as the necessity for them ceased.[1] Even while these organizations

[1] ABHMS An. Rep., 1913., pp. 33-5.

were in existence, the foreign-speaking churches were officially regarded as constituents of American Baptist organizations and were constantly urged to maintain close relationships with the latter in order to facilitate and to expedite the eventual transition.[1] Nor was the policy to change after 1913.[2]

The reason this policy was not realized in the case of the German mission was not because its constituents never became sufficiently Americanized. On the contrary, they were making unprecedented progress in this regard and adopted most of the dominant American ideals, as is reflected in their religious, political, and cultural views.

For instance, in regard to their views on the use of alcoholic beverages (a pseudo-religious criterion of Americanization which had been one of the American Baptists' chief criticisms of the German Baptists), the latter came very close to the dominant sentiments in the country as a whole. For, whereas in the previous period they had only taken a decisive stand on temperance, they now completed the harder step to total abstinence.

The transition was neither sudden nor easy. A growing number of voices for prohibition began to make themselves heard during the 1880's. Among them was the editor of Der Sendbote during that decade.[3] The Texas

---

[1] BHMM, Nov. 1891, p. 302; ABHMS An. Rep., 1898, p. 59; Missions, Nov. 1913, p. 846.

[2] E.g., Davis C. Woolley, et. al., Baptist Advance (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1964), p. 70.

[3] DS, July 12, 1882, p. 212; ibid., Jan. 9, 1884, p. 13; ibid., Jan. 4, 1888, p. 4.

Conference seemed to favor it,[1] and German-Russian Baptists, immigrating in growing numbers, definitely advocated it. Sunday school teachers of the Eastern Conference were urged to take a decisive stand against all consumption of alcohol,[2] and the Sunday school institute of the same conference advised its young people to abstain entirely from spirited beverages.[3] But in 1890 there was still considerable controversy over the issue.

Those who opposed prohibition contended that it was only a cultural trend and not a scriptural imperative; that the Eskimos, Lapplanders, and Mohammodans sufficiently demonstrated that the abolition of alcoholic beverages does not eliminate as much misery and vice as some were claiming it might; and that moderation could be practised in America as well as in Germany.[4] Those who favored total abstinence argued that health reasons alone should be sufficient grounds for their position; the dreadful economic and social consequences of drinking would advise it; Christians should have no part in the gross injustice of the liquor industry; and the least a Christian could do in this matter was to deny himself for the sake of his weaker brother.[5]

This open discussion of the issue did not immediately settle the question, but it did help to turn the tide in favor of prohibition. Whereas in 1890 prohibition was still an unpopular subject in the German

---

[1] Verh. (JK), 1884, p. 67. [2] DS, Oct. 20, 1886, p. 333.

[3] Ibid., Oct. 3, 1888, p. 5. [4] Ibid., Aug. 6, 1890, p. 5.

[5] Ibid., Oct. 1, 1890, p. 5; ibid., Oct. 15, 1890, p. 5.

XUM

churches, after that date Der Sendbote began carrying a greater number of articles against the use of alcoholic beverages, even though the editor was far from consenting to rigid prohibition as late as 1895,[1] and only rarely did anyone venture to oppose total abstinence in this denominational publication. With the appointment of a new editor in 1902, frequent editorials and a regular column were given to comments on temperence and total abstinence, with a definite drift toward the latter.[2] And whereas in the late 1890's visiting saloons was only "discontenanced,"[3] within a few years the Central Conference assured the Anti-saloon League of its hearty support and the editor of Der Sendbote emphatically denounced all saloons.[4] More than that, by 1910 German Baptists were berating their countrymen in America for opposing total abstinence, repeatedly denying that prohibition caused deprivation of personal freedom.[5] Der Sendbote may not always have spoken for the entire constituency of the denomination, but it nevertheless clearly reflected a changing mood in the German churches, because the editors tried hard to keep the paper representative.

Whole conferences, admittedly, were slow in adopting resolutions on total abstinence. As early as 1894 the Eastern Conference called for a

---

[1] Ibid., Aug. 21, 1895, p. 4.

[2] These tended to stress the harmful physical effects of alcohol, though they included the whole burrage of arguments employed by American prohibitionists.

[3] BHMM, Sept. 1898, p. 320.

[4] Verh. (JK), 1901, p. 13; DS, July 13, 1904, p. 440; ibid., June 28, 1905, p. 408.

[5] DS, July 5, 1905, p. 424; ibid., Jan. 25, 1911, p. 7; et. al.

decisive stand on the issue.[1] Some of the other conferences also favored total abstinence, and most German Baptists seemed to be pleased with the progress of the prohibition movement. But it was not until the early 1930's that the General Conference declared itself unreservedly in favor of prohibition.[2] This was nevertheless still several years before the Germans' 1940 decision to remain a distinct denomination.

In some more specifically religious matters, the German Baptists, in a sense, became too Americanized to feel comfortable in American Baptists circles, because they continued to resist assimilation into that fellowship to no small extent on account of what American Baptists called Puritanism.[3] A German spirit pervaded their worship services as long as they were held in German. Worship was regarded as a very serious matter, the music was slow, the meeting houses were usually humble, and the sermons were often lengthy.[4] At the same time they had imbibed certain American religious values more fully than their American brethren.

Even some American Baptists were readily conceding this point. Commenting on foreign-speaking Baptists generally, but with particular reference to the German and Swedish Baptists, Dr. Lemuel C. Barnes of the ABHMS alleged in 1913:

---

[1] Verh. (JK), 1894, p. 19.

[2] Verh. (Gen.), 1931, p. 14; ibid., 1934, pp. 19-20.

[3] Whether or not these are Puritan tenets may be debatable. But what really matters is that American Baptists interpreted them as such and as signs of Americanization.

[4] BHMM, Sept. 1898, pp. 319-20.

> All who are well acquainted with our foreign-speaking churches will agree that in may aspects of that old-fashioned Puritanism which laid the foundations of American Christianity and American greatness, they far excel the direct descendants of the Puritans in our time.[1]

In his judgment there seemed to be more of

> the New England conscience in our foreign-speaking church members than there is on the average in the direct line. In conservatism of the old ideals of religious life, they outweigh us greatly. Though as yet in numbers they may be little more than one to ten, in Puritanism they are more nearly ten to one.[2]

They would bring strength to the larger denomination, because

> as a whole it is well within the facts [based on public examination] to say that the foreign-speaking Baptist churches in the United States have an apostolic simplicity and earnestness of religious life in advance of that shown by the English-speaking churches.[3]

Even allowing for undeserved generosity in Barnes' remarks, American Baptists no longer questioned the spirituality of their German counterparts. On the contrary, the latter had so fully adjusted to the "spiritual Christianity" of which the nativists prided themselves that it was now they who felt called upon to question and admonish the American Baptists about deviations from these norms.

German Baptists continued to take a firm stand on separation from the world and on church discipline. By the turn of the century, most of them were strongly opposed to the theatre.[4] Viewing this form of entertainment demoralizing and spiritually debilitating, they even resorted to the exclusion of those who persisted to indulge in it.[5] When, therefore,

---

[1] Missions, Nov. 1913, p. 845. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., Nov. 1912, p. 861. See also DS, May 8, 1912, p. 12.

[4] DS, March 3, 1897, p. 4.

[5] Ibid., Sept. 28, 1898, p. 618; ibid., March 21, 1900, p. 184; ibid., Sept. 17, 1902, p. 594.

XUM

theatrical productions noticeably deteriorated and came under widespread criticism during the first decade of this century, German Baptists were all the more confirmed in their convictions and repeatedly and unreservedly denounced the theatre as "reprehensible and most corruptible," and "without doubt one of the greatest enemies of morality," with which Christians should have absolutely nothing to do.[1] From the tone of some motions passed by the General Conference in 1934, it is clear they were still standing resolute.[2]

Similarly, they viewed the dance as an expression of carnal pleasure and sensuality.[3] As one of them described it, "It leads to vanity; it panders to the lust of the eyes and arrogance; it undermines Christianity and morality. True Christianity and the modern dance are as diametrically opposite as the Southpole and the Northpole."[4] It was definitely and clearly viewed as a sin and not something that could be done in the name of Jesus as the Apostle Paul had instructed (I Cor. 10:31).[5]

Any activity or attitude which suggested conformity to the world was highly suspect. A craze for the latest fashions, for example, was frequently denounced, and church members were urged to exercise modest simplicity in clothing. The use of diamonds and other adornments was thought to lead to ostentation. Although interesting from an ecological

---

[1]E.g., ibid., Feb. 10, 1904, p. 89; ibid., Nov. 8, 1905, p. 713; ibid., April 3, 1907, p. 9; ibid., Nov. 24, 1909, p. 8; ibid., April 12, 1911, p. 6.

[2]Verh. (Gen.), 1934, pp. 16, 20. [3]DS, July 25, 1906, p. 472.

[4]Ibid., April 5, 1911, p. 6. [5]Ibid., Jan. 8, 1913, p. 9.

XUM

perspective, in 1901 one of the main reasons given for censuring the use of bird feathers to ornament ladies's hats was to halt the massive slaughter of birds necessary to provide the feathers.[1] One historian of the Conference held that there were probably more exclusions on account of these kinds of amusements and for immodesty than on any other grounds.[2]

Since some American Baptist churches were more lenient in these matters, the German Baptists continued to think of themselves as excelling in piety. Even the judicious Walter Rauschenbusch said of them:

> Their religion is perhaps less showy than the common type, but there is more real fellowship with God in it. They get up less "steam," but they turn more of it into work. We should not like to pass sweeping judgements, but we think there is a sharper separation from the world with them than with American churches of similar environment. The German Baptists who dance, or attend theatres, are isolated cases. Candidates for baptism are examined more carefully and church discipline is more frequent.[3]

And when some of them fell short of these standards, it was often assumed to be largely due to the detrimental influence of the English-speaking churches.[4] Young people, in particular, were urged to keep distant from "the secularization and the unbiblical tendency . . . which frequently prevails in the English camp of our denomination."[5]

Thus, ironically, by adhering so tenaciously to these so-called tenets of American Puritanism, the German Baptists only erected another barrier between themselves and the American Baptists rather than being

---

[1] Ibid., Oct. 16, 1901, p. 648; ibid., Sept. 24, 1902, p. 615.

[2] Krueger, op. cit., p. 40. [3] Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 12.

[4] DS, Nov. 2, 1898, p. 697.

[5] Ibid., Feb. 8, 1911, p. 7. See also ibid., May 31, 1916, p. 6.

drawn into the parent fellowship. What was understood to be a form of Americanization resulted in the immigrant group withdrawing even further from the American body rather than being assimilated into it. In fact, this rift clearly widened during this period.

Religion consists of more than regulations regarding the use of alcoholic beverages, non-conformity to the world, and rigid church discipline, but these were the issues on which there was believed to be the widest and most serious cleavage between these two Baptist bodies.[1]

Whether or not the German Baptists had become sufficiently Americanized in other aspects of religion never became an issue. That is not to say that there were, for example, no theological difference or tensions between themselves and the American Baptists. But these were not directly related to the question of Americanization. It was no longer possible to claim any one theology as the dominant theology of the country or even of the American Baptists to which the new Americans may have been asked to conform. In other words, there was no criterion of theological Americanization. Therefore, one can not really measure the theological Americanization of the German Baptists. In any case, American Baptists had far more serious theological differences and conflicts within their own ranks than between themselves and the German Baptists.[2]

Thus, the German Baptists had rectified those religious and pseudo-religious beliefs and practices which American Baptists had found most

---

[1] BHMM, Jan. 1896, p. 31; ibid., Feb. 1897, p. 59.

[2] Kuhn, op. cit., p. 245.

un-American and objectionable. Yet their Americanization at these points did not culminate in institutional assimilation with their American brethren as had been expected. It would therefore appear that a lack of Americanization in religion was not the obstacle. In fact, one of the largest barriers to closer fellowship and assimilation, as we have seen, was the result of what American Baptists themselves regarded as the German Baptists' closer adherence to traditional American religious values.

Nor was the political Americanization of German Baptists a serious obstacle to assimilation. The American Baptists, for their part, no longer had any serious misgivings about the former's influence upon American politics. On the contrary, as has been shown, they adopted their foreign-speaking brethren as fellow Nordics and defenders of American traditions and, for the most part, trusted their patriotism even during the crisis of World War I.

The German Baptists, for their part, demonstrated that this trust was not misplaced. As the years passed, of course, a growing percentage of their constituency was born in this country and had never known any other political loyalties. But foreign-born together with the American-born came to the support of the United States in the Spanish-American War;[1] Walter Rauschenbusch even defended America's action in a Frankfort paper and apparently exerted considerable influence on public opinion in Germany.[2] And perhaps an even more representative indication of their

---

[1] DS, June 15, 1898, p. 377; ibid., June 24, 1898, p. 408; ibid., July 20, 1898, p. 456.

[2] Ibid., Aug. 17, 1898, pp. 505ff.

sympathies is reflected in the General Conference's support of the Citizen's League in 1910. If affirmed:

> Because we believe that the aims of the Citizen's League are lofty and worthy ones and because it is very necessary in our fair and free land to take up arms and to combat heroically all anti-Christian movements and morally hostile forces, we heartily recommend the Citizen's League with its aims and its aspirations to the attention of our churches and hope that it may grow and prosper and that in our churches also many members may be won for it and be drawn into its noble and Christian endeavor. God bless this good, moral movement![2]

Who could question such patriotism?

Of course, the test by fire of their patriotism was World War I. As early as 1894 their General Missionary Secretary reminded American Baptists of the 180,000 foreign-born German-Americans who had enlisted in the Union army during the Civil War and assured them that, in the event of another war, a much larger number would again gather under the glorious standard and be ready to lay their lives on the altar of their country, even if it were a war with the government of Emperor William.[3] And so they did twenty-three years later. Because so many of them had relatives and friends in Germany, their sympathies were naturally with the Fatherland during the three years of American's neutrality. Nor were they able to instantaneously suppress these feelings when America entered the war. But irrespective of these sympathies, the German Baptists declared their loyalty to the United States from the outset[4] and deeply resented the nativists' insinuations that all hyphenates were less patriotic than

---

[1] Ibid., Aug. 17, 1898, pp. 505ff. [2] Verh. (Gen.), 1910, p. 16.

[3] BHMM, Sept. 1894, p. 374. [4] Watchman-Examiner, March 11, 1915, p. 311.

XUM

native Americans.[1] At least rationally, they never questioned their Christian and patriotic duty to support their adopted country. And the editor of Der Sendbote clinched the argument when he reasoned that if God permitted the War, it must be at least in his permissive will, obligating them to accept the War and reinforcing their Christian duty toward civil authorities.[2] Lest unnaturalized immigrants might think that they were exempt from such loyalty, they were reminded several times that it was required of residents of a country as well.[3] Thereafter, no further proof of patriotism was needed.

And finally, during this period, even the largest and most persistent obstacle to assimilation, namely the use of English in religious activities, was largely overcome. Resistance to the change was still strong until World War I, but thereafter the transition progressed relatively fast.

One reason for the initial resistance was the fact that the use of German was still on the rise in the country at large. German

> immigrants who came across after 1900 had grown up since the establishment of the Empire and had been subjected to the universal education and nationalizing influences that imparted to them acute awareness of their German identity.[4]

Therefore, they tended to cling to their culture even more tenaciously than their predecessors had. Through their efforts a growing number of educational institutions incorporated German into their curricula, and,

---

[1] DS, May 24, 1916, p. 226. [2] Ibid., April 4, 1917, p. 6.

[3] Ibid., May 8, 1918, p. 6; ibid., June 12, 1918, p. 6.

[4] Handlin, The American People, p. 76.

XUM

"at the outbreak of the World War, there were more German-language newspapers in several states then all other immigrant publications combined."[1] Even on the world scene, the use of German was phenomenal. In 1909 it was spoken by eighty-seven million people, second only to English.[2] In view of these developments, it was only natural for German Baptists to continue using it as well.

Their principal reason for doing so, however, was that their work still demanded it. Continued German immigration was bringing a constant stream of new arrivals who could be reached in no other way. In addition, German Baptists were discovering that the whelming tide of immigrants from eastern Europe could also be reached more effectively in German than in English,[3] which suggested that their mission might even need to expand despite the declining immigration from Germany itself. And, of course, there was always that host of German-Americans who had clung to their German culture and knew English so imperfectly that an English gospel was practically no gospel at all for them. As Walter Rauschenbusch observed, they would "readily learn English enough to earn bread and to gossip, but not enough to understand preaching."[4]

Therefore, most German Baptist churches continued to use German and to promote its use at the seminary, in order to train pastors capable

---

[1]Wittke, op. cit., p. 229. [2]DS, Oct. 27, 1909, p. 12.

[3]See chapter 8.

[4]Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 12. See also DS, Oct. 16, 1895, p. 4; ibid., June 21, 1899, p. 392; ABHMS An. Rep., 1899, p. 103; BHMM, June 1901, pp. 175-6.

of communicating effectively with their constituency, and even in their Sunday schools, in order to assure that their youth would be able to understand the language and to use it well enough to move into positions of leadership in the churches. In the face of a growing demand for English, one pastor declared, "We well remain German, even if we have to say it in English."[1]

The gradual, but inevitable, transition to the use of English, however, could not be stopped, especially in the Sunday schools and young people's societies.[2] Among the second to fourth generations German Baptists a growing number could neither read nor write German, speak it fluently, or even understand it.

In the Sunday schools, for instance, the use of English spread very noticeably (particularly in the cities and the eastern conferences). From a few schools that were using at least some English at the beginning of this period, the number increased to nearly one half of the total by 1919 and progressively on to the vast majority of them by World War II.[3]

The introduction of English instruction led to the adoption of English reading materials as well. As a result, after 1896 subscriptions for German Sunday school materials began to drop, despite an increase in

---

[1] DS, Sept. 3, 1913, p. 9. See also ibid., Oct. 15, 1902, p. 658; Verh. (Gen.), 1904, 1st App., p. 6; DS, Feb. 8, 1911, p. 7; ibid., May 10, 1916, p. 7.

[2] Ramaker, op. cit., pp. 107ff.

[3] Verh. (Gen.), 1892, 1st App., p. I; ibid., 1901, 1st App., p. III; ibid., 1904, 1st App., pp. 6-7; ibid., 1910, 5th App., p. III; ibid., 1919, pp. 31-2.

XUM

Sunday schools and young people. Noticing a substantial drift in this direction for several years but unable to check it, the publication society decided in 1913 to move with the tide by including two pages of English in its major Sunday school publication. Since that measure resulted in increased circulation of the publication, as much as one half of it was devoted to English materials by 1925, and by 1940 it had been entirely replaced, mostly by other English supplies.[1]

Youth publications are a further index of this drift toward English among the young people. By 1916 the need for English materials had become so pressing that a part of the young people's section of the Vereins-Herald (a periodical for young people's and women's societies) was relinquished to English articles.[2] Still failing to meet the existing need, particularly in view of the accelerated Americanization forced upon German-Americans by the War, the next General Conference decided to publish both a German and an English paper.[3] Only three years later, the German paper was discontinued and the English one replaced by an enlarged family paper in the same language.[4] Although primarily a young people's and Sunday school paper, it prospered so well that sometime between 1937 and 1940 its circulation surpassed that of the old denominational Sendbote.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., 1910, 5th App., p. III; ibid., 1913, p. 44.

[2] Ibid., 1916, p. 9.

[3] Der Jugendfreund and Yokefellow (Ibid., 1919, pp. 40-1).

[4] The Baptist Herald (Ibid., 1922, p. 41).

[5] Ibid., 1934, p. 28; ibid., 1940, p. 27.

XUM

In order to retain these young people and others who had equal difficulty with German, the churches were under increasing pressure to adopt the language of the land in the worship services as well. Because of continued resistance to this change, it progressed only slowly until World War I. Nevertheless, it was gaining ground, particularly in areas which were not receiving any new immigration, so that as early as 1898 all the churches in an entire eastern association had become either completely or partially English.[1]

What had been only a gradual process until the War was greatly accelerated by that halocaust. Given the hatred for anything German during the war years, some churches were persuaded to adopt English just to avoid undue public criticism and discrimination. Many more were forced to make the change in order to retain their young people, since that age group, and particularly those who had been born in America, were most sensitive to the suspicion and attacks directed against German churches.[2] And, thirdly, a large number were forced to abandon German because they were located in those states where any services in a foreign language was prohibited.[3] Most of the latter returned to the use of German as soon as the prohibition was lifted but were never again as German as before.

This crisis also seems to have changed the prevailing attitude toward the use of English among the officialdom of the denomination. Whereas as late as 1916 they generally discouraged the churches from

---

[1] BHMM, Sept. 1898, p. 316. [2] Verh.(Gen.), 1919, p. 17.

[3] DS, April 30, 1919, p. 1.

introducing English unnecessarily or too quickly and urged that German be retained to the uttermost for the sake of the churches' special mission,[1] by as early as 1919 the mood appears to have changed significantly. At that year's general conference, the churches were advised, "to convey the gospel to the people in the language in which they best understand it. For it is not a question of preserving the German language, but rather of saving souls."[2] And again:

> Without intending hastily and unduly to promote the Anglicizing of a congregation, it nevertheless appears an imperative duty to avail ourselves of the English language where we can preserve the heritage of the fathers and build the congregation only with its help.[3]

By 1928 the General Conference even passed this amazing recommendation:

> Let us now cease to speak of a language problem; rather let us consider it a privilege to be permitted to work in both languages. In general the new brothers and sisters from Germany, after all, have a clear conception of the language difficulties. They perceive well that they are living in a foreign land and are eager to learn the language. The problem does not lie with them but rather with the grandfathers and grandmothers who have to talk English with their grandchildren but do not permit one to make use of the language which these youngsters understand in the church. . . . One can not establish rules applicable to all churches. Each church must overcome for itself. We, therefore, recommend to all our churches that they dispense with the language problem, in all calmness and discretion, under the guidance of the Holy Sprit, by viewing it as a special privilege to be permitted to work in both languages.[4]

In other words, the Conference was admitting that German, or at least an exclusively German mission, was not necessary to reach the new arrivals--as had hitherto been persistently maintained--and instead gratefully accepted the privilege of a bilingual ministry. A bilingual hymnal was

---

[1] Ibid., May 10, 1916, p. 7; ibid., July 26, 1916, p. 7; ibid., Oct. 4, 1916, p. 7; Verh. (Gen.), 1916, p. 43.

[2] Verh. (Gen.), 1919, p. 16. [3] Ibid., p. 17.

[4] Ibid., 1928, p. 10. See also ibid., p. 8.

XUM

published that same year.[1]

As a consequence, many more churches followed suit. Although for many of them the change involved tensions, painful convulsions, and schisms, by the early 1940's "a considerable number" of them were entirely English and "the great majority of the other" were already in the bilingual stage.[2]

Bilingual churches required bilingual ministers, resulting in expanded use of English in the seminary as well. Taking cognizance of the drift toward English in some of the churches and being

> profoundly conscious of the fact that without proficiency in the language of our common country there will be in the theological education of the future German American Baptist minister a deficiency that will make them unfit for their calling,[3]

each professor in the pre-theological department was required to teach in English one to two hours a day as early as 1894. Five years later nearly one half of the pre-theological courses were taught in English,[4] and by 1909 and 1913 the course in English language was extended to three and four years respectively.[5] One received the impression, though, that the extended use of English was primarily for the benefit of non-theological students in the academy and those theological students who were planning to continue their studies in the English Department of Rochester Theological Seminary, because all the courses in the theological program of the German Department were taught in German until 1918.[6]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 51. [2] Kuhn, op. cit., p. 252.

[3] NYBUME An. Rep., 1894, p. 36. [4] DS, July 19, 1899, p. 457.

[5] Verh. (Gen.), 1910, 6th App., p. VII; ibid., 1913, pp. 29-30.

[6] E.g., DS, Aug. 7, 1895, p. 5.

XUM

What the natural process of Americanization failed to accomplish the War did. Because second to fourth gneration German-Americans felt most unjustly insulted by the discrimination against Germans and were the least likely to withstand the concerted effort to eradicate everything German in America, candidates for the ministry among them were reluctant to attend a German seminary. As a result of this and other factors there was a sharp drop in the enrolment.[1] With this marked reduction of seminary students; the termination of immigration from Germany; and the intensified problem of retaining the youth, caused by anti-Germanism; the future of the mission was much more seriously called into question than ever before. Although no one yet knew what the future would hold, all signs seemed to indicate that in order to survive, the churches would probably have to introduce more English into all of their activities.[2] Beginning with the 1918-1919 school-year, therefore, one half of the theological courses were taught in English and, for the first time, the commencement was held in that language.[3] Due to growing requests for bilingual pastors, even further attention was given to English after 1922,[4] and by 1940 the pendulum had swung to the opposite side. Then, rather than assuring that it included enough English, the seminary had to take precautions to retain enough German to prepare American-born students adequately for bilingual churches.[5]

---

[1]Moreover, 66 per cent of the students between 1916 and 1919 were foreign-born (Verh. [Gen.], 1919, p. 18).

[2]DS, Feb. 19, 1919, p. 7. [3]Ibid.; Verh. (Gen.), 1919, p. 18.

[4]Verh. (Gen.), 1922, p. 6; Ramaker, op. cit., p. 88.

[5]Verh. (Gen.), 1934, p. 45; ibid., 1940, p. 33.

From the local congregations and the seminary, the use of English spread to associations and conferences. It began with occasional addresses in that language[1] and with the singing of English songs at the general conferences after World War I. The young people, however, were not satisfied with this kind of tokenism. After the War they began to hold their sessions at the various conferences in English and to petition program committees for more of it in the general sessions as well.[2] In response to such a request:

> that the Conference use the language which is native to our young people who are to form our future constituency in its sessions, in order that the way may be opened to urge their attendance at the Conference and that they might get the fullest benefit of the transactions,[3]

the Eastern Conference voted in 1933 to adopt English as its official language. Other regional conferences were slower in making this transition but were also using an increasing amount of English in conference reports and resolutions during the decade of the 1930's. As a result of World War II, however, almost all of their sessions were being held in English by 1944.[4] The General Conference had moved somewhat faster. Also attempting to draw the younger generation into all of its deliberations,[5] it presented all of its resolutions and some of its reports in English at the 1937 session and, with the exception of two services, held the entire 1940 conference in the language of the land.[6]

---

[1]E.g., DS, Jan. 20, 1897, p. 2; Verh. (Gen.), 1907, 1910.

[2]Verh. (JK), 1933, p. 19. [3]Ibid., p. 18.

[4]North American Baptist General Conference. Minutes (Cleveland, 1944), p. 57.

[5]Verh. (Gen.), 1931, p. 20; ibid., 1934, p. 15. [6]Ibid., 1940, p. 7.

XUM

Adopting the use of English in religious relationships was the most difficult step in the Americanization of the German Baptists, as it has been for most immigrant churches. For as H. Richard Niebuhr has observed, "The language question has been one of the most difficult with which immigrant churches have had to deal, for it involved the problem of rebirth in a new civilization."[1] The reason it is such a difficult area of one's life to change, Johannes J. Mol has further proposed is that the immigrant finds inner security in religion, and since all his other relationships are in flux, he clings to it with greater tenacity than he normally would.[2] Moreover, "Religion, no matter how secularized it may be, or how much it may be associated with more temporal aspects of its existence, is still concerned with the most central values and sentiments of life." And it is hard "'to allow one's central system of values and attitudes to the influenced,'"[3] or even to conceptualize or express them in another language.

For the same reasons, the use of English in religious activities was also the surest sign of Americanization; "the adoption of the native tongue is the most obvious symptom of the assimilation of the native culture as a whole."[4] Indeed, the German Baptists had come a long way in their Americanization, and the more Americanized they became the more their churches served as facilitators of the process for new arrivals. For even biligual churches can significantly facilitate the integration

---

[1]H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism, Meridian Books (Cleveland; World Publishing Company, 1957), p. 211.

[2]Mol, op. cit., p. 47. [3]Ibid., p. 48.

[4]Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 212.

of immigrants into the native culture.[1]

The extent of their Americanization can be further seen in the swelling stream of members that flowed from the German to the English churches. In 1894 the General Missionary Secretary of the German churches predicted, "It is only a question of time when the German language will no more be used. If emigration ceases, our work will soon be accomplished, and all our churches will become English-speaking churches."[2] That prediction still has not come true, but the assimilation process not only continued but accelerated during the years under study. Between 1892 and 1907, between two hundred and two hundred and fifty transferred their membership annually,[3] and, despite constant discouragement,[4] at least 16,320 had done so by the early 1940's.[5] If one added their descendants and those whose records were not found by the statisticians, that number would probably be more than doubled, because already in 1913 it was estimated to be over 30,000.[6]

In at least thirty cases, entire congregations severed their ties

---

[1]Mol, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

[2]BHMM, Sept. 1898, pp. 372-3. See also ABHMS An. Rep., 1896, p. 103.

[3]ABHMS An. Rep., 1907, p. 104.

[4]BHMM, Sept. 1898, pp. 317-8; DS, Dec. 28, 1898, p. 824; ibid., Sept. 27, 1899, pp. 616-7; Verh. (JK), 1906, p. 5; Verh. (Gen.), 1928, p. 18.

[5]Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 236-7.

[6]ABHMS An. Rep., 1913, p. 59. See also ibid., 1897, p. 115; BHMM, June 1901, p. 174.

with German associations and conferences while maintaining or establishing membership in the American Baptist couterparts.[1] About an equal number of those who had completed their mission, were unable to sustain themselves, or for some other reason disbanded, were dissolved and amalgamated, as an entirety or in part, with existing American Baptist churches.[2]

Yet in spite of all this manifest progress in Americanization, the German Baptists, as a body, became more independent rather than being assimilated into the American Baptist denomination. Ties with the WABHMS tapered sharply after 1917, the long-standing relationship to the ABHMS was severed in 1920, the plan of cooperation with the ABFMS was virtually exhausted after 1922, the former German Department of Rochester Theological Seminary became more or less independent in 1940, and that same year the General Conference for all practical purposes resolved to perpetuate itself.

That raises the crucial question, Why did it happen? Why is it that the ultimate purpose of the mission, namely institutional assimilation, was thwarted just at the time when its basic condition, namely the Americanization of the German Baptists, had been most fully realized?

---

[1]Kuhn, op. cit., p. 236.

[2]Frank Kaiser placed the number at seven in Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 236-7, but as early as 1913, twenty-five congregations had dissolved, of which many members joined English churches (Verh. [Gen.], 1913, p. 28; ABHMS An. Rep., 1904, p. 103), and the Central Conference alone lost thirteen churches between 1910 and 1913, some of which were dissolved and merged with American Baptist churches.

XUM

Is it that Americanization is not in fact the basic condition for the assimilation for foreign-speaking people, or that this consideration was simply overbalanced by other factors, despite its importance to the assimilation process?

It was World War I which severed the tie between the German Baptists and the WABHMS. This society had generously assisted in the support of female German missionaries for about thirty-five years when it suddenly terminated the program during and immediately following the War, obligating the German churches to assume the expense themselves. The reasons for this action are difficult to ascertain, but the extensive anti-Germanism of the war years and the unpopularity of a program of financial aid to German-Americans apparently were major considerations.[1]

In other connections, the growing financial independence of the German Baptists was an important factor. Most of their ties with American Baptist institutions were based on financial arrangements. When they became financially self-sufficient, therefore, their ties with the parent body were automatically dissipated, despite the fact that their Americanization had brought them closer to the American Baptists in other ways.

This certainly was the case in their relationship with the ABHMS. The plan of cooperation between the home mission societies of the two groups had been arranged primarily to provide financial assistance to German Baptist home missionaries. To maintain some control over its

---

[1] DS, April 30, 1919, p. 2; Verh. (Gen.), 1922, p. 20.

XUM

contributions, the ABHMS also assumed the administration of the joint endeavor, but basically it was a financial arrangement.

The growing self-sufficiency of the Germans in itself, therefore, predicated the certain termination of the relationship. Even before that had happened, they were given full administrative control of the enterprise. Whereas before 1910 the ABHMS had had the last word in the appointment of German Baptist home missionaries and had paid their salaries upon receipt of quarterly reports of their missionary activities, thereafter the German Baptist General Missionary Society independently performed these same administrative tasks. And whereas before the German Baptists had sent their share of the missionaries salaries to the American Baptist society, now the reverse was the case.[1] In a real sense, the former American Baptist mission had become an independent mission merely aided by the American Baptists. Therefore, when in 1920 the German Baptists became financially self-supporting as well, they became entirely independent in the area of home missions.

Other factors were not entirely absent. The German Baptists, for instance, had always enjoyed more independence from the ABHMS than any other foreign nationalities aided by that society, because they received their assistance directly from the Society whereas the others received theirs through the state conventions and city mission societies, obligating them to relate more closely to those organizations.[2] When, there-

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1910, 1st App., pp. VI-V; DS, May 8, 1912, p. 5.

[2] E.g., ABHMS An. Rep., 1913, p. 35.

fore, the Northern Baptist Convention assumed control over the denomination's budgetary matters and demoted the German Baptists from their privileged status in 1919, the latter were offended and irritated.[1] Nor were they at that point in their history about to be forced into a more dependent relationship to American Baptist state conventions.[2] World War I, undoubtedly, also strained the relationship to some extent.

On the other hand, there are good reasons to believe that these were not the basic causes for the parting of the ways in 1920. The ABHMS had for decades constantly urged the Germans to become self-supporting (especially when newer and weaker foreign-speaking nationalities were crying for help), knowing full well that financial self-sufficiency would also result in greater institutional independence. More than that, the Society had intentionally been forcing the Germans out of the nest by compelling them to assume a growing share of their home mission costs. And it was the Home Mission Society that initiated the transfer of administrative responsibilities in 1910.

The Germans, for their part, were clearly aware of the ABHMS's intentions and knew that they would have to row their own canoe sooner or later, but held on to the Society's aid as long as possible. They knew as early as 1907 that they could manage without the Society's help, if all of their members were to contribute as much as they were

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1919, p. 8.

[2] The state conventions maintained some of the administrative control which the Germans had already gained in 1910. Therefore, this new relationship was also a major step beckwards for the latter (Verh. [JK], 1919, p. 61).

XUM

able,[1] and even before the Northern Baptist Convention's decision in 1919, they were already able to stand on their own feet and even to return some aid to the American Baptists.[2]

Therefore, the 1919 decision only expedited the announcement of a fait accompli. Nor did the War generate the added determination to become independent, because the German Baptists still intentionally postponed their withdrawal from the ABHMS until two years after the war.[3] And when they did finally declare their independence, it was done cordially and with the benign intent of freeing some of the Society's funds for newer and more needy missions among the foreign nationalities.[4]

Thus was severed by far the most important tie between these two Baptist bodies, and the German Baptists became an independent denomination.[5] Accordingly, the mission to German-Americans became almost exclusively their mission rather than one of the American Baptists. It was they who now were sending out the missionaries and paying their salaries. Therefore, this account of the mission could supposedly end at 1920.

On the other hand, American Baptists continued to make limited contributions to the mission in other areas, and still had the claim of

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1907, 5th App., p. III; DS, May 6, 1908, p. 11; ibid., May 7, 1912, p. 2.

[2] DS, May 1, 1918, p. 8. [3] Ibid.,; Verh. (Gen.), 1919, p. 8.

[4] DS, April 7, 1920, p. 2; ABHMS An. Rep., 1920, pp. 12-5.

[5] E.g., Verh. (Gen.), 1929, p. 187.

a parent over the German body. More than that, they were still expecting the temporarily independent child eventually to return to the family and be fully assimilated into it.[1] Nor was the ultimate consequence of their work at this point known until 1940, when it became fairly certain that the German Baptists would remain independent.

One of those areas in which some cooperation still continued was that of foreign missions. When in 1880 a young German Baptist and his wife expressed an interest in missionary service among heathen people, the German churches did not deem it necessary to supplement the efforts of the American Baptists by starting an independent foreign mission endeavor; nor could they have afforded one. Instead, they encouraged the missionary candidates to apply to the American Baptist Missionary Union.[2] The young couple was commissioned by that society, and in the following four decades at least nineteen other young men (plus their spouses, in most cases) and possibly many more took the same course of action.[3] This meant that they were technically American Baptist foreign missionaries. The German Baptists, nevertheless, contributed to their support and retained a prayerful interest in their activities. To that extent, therefore, recruiting them, sending them out, and sustaining them were all joint endeavors.

Meanwhile, the Germans began to assist their less fortunate

---

[1] E.g., ABHMS An. Rep., 1920, p. 15.

[2] Known as the ABFMS after 1910.

[3] "General Catalogue, 1819-1930," Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin, III (Oct., 1930), pp. 286, 291-6. Kuhn, op. cit., p. 240 places the number at close to ninety-five but does not validate this figure.

co-religionists in Europe, where the ABMU was doing less,[1] and also in the German colony of the Cameroons in West Africa. Unable to secure the cooperation of the ABMU for joint action in these areas,[2] they turned instead to a missionary committee in Germany. A plan was arranged whereby German Baptists in America sent their contributions to the missionary committee in Germany which in turn recommended pastors and missionaries for appointment and supervised their work, very much like the plan of cooperation with the ABMU, except that in this case it was the German Baptists in America who appointed and commissioned the pastors and missionaries who were to receive aid.[3]

When this plan of cooperation failed in 1895,[4] the ABMU agreed to assume the administrative duties of these German Baptist ventures in Germany and the Cameroons in addition to those for their joint efforts among heathen people elsewhere.[5] The German Baptists retained the right to appoint the missionaries and to designate the funds contributed by their churches, but at least they were not engaged in any foreign missions independent of the ABMU.

After the turn of the century, however, there was a gradual drift toward independence in this area as well. Beginning in 1901, the German

---

[1] Verh. (E), 1883, p. 11; DS, May 28, 1884, p. 172.

[2] DS, May 27, 1885, p. 172; ibid., May 11, 1887, p. 4.

[3] Ibid., May 15, 1889, p. 4; Verh. (Gen.), 1889, p. 103.

[4] DS, May 13, 1896, p. 3.

[5] Ibid., pp. 3, 5; Verh. (Gen.), 1901, 1st App., pp. VIII-IX.

Baptists began their own missionary work among Germans in South America,[1] in 1904 they organized a new German-American missionary committee to supervise their work in Europe, and in 1906 they re-established ties with the committee in Germany which administered the mission in the Cameroons.[2] During the first decade of this century, some of their churches further began to designate their contributions to foreign missions for specific purposes. Since these were sent directly to the recipients stipulated, only the undesignated funds were still channelled through the ABMU.[3]

After the interruptions of these efforts during the War, they were renewed on an even more independent basis than before. The plan of cooperation with the ABFMS was continued, but after the Germans further decided to begin their own foreign missions to the heathen in 1922,[4] very few, if any, of them accepted appointments from the ABFMS and contributions to that society were soon discontinued.[5]

Here, again, the growing financial self-sufficiency of the German Baptists was a significant factor in their withdrawal from cooperation with the American Baptist society. Their giving for foreign missions multiplied by about eight-fold between 1893 and 1922,[6] and since their

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1901, 1st App., pp. VII-VIII.

[2] DS, May 2, 1906, p. 285.

[3] Verh. (Gen.), 1910, 1st App., pp. VI-VII; DS, May 8, 1912, p. 11.

[4] DS, May 10, 1922, p. 7.

[5] Verh. (Gen.), 1922, pp. 24, 33; "General Catalogue, 1819-1930," pp. 291-6.

[6] Verh. (Gen.), 1898, 8th App.; ibid., 1922, p. 29.

XUM

relationship to the ABFMS was basically a financial one, it tended to dissipate as the need for it diminished. Furthermore, the more the Germans contributed the more they naturally also wanted to have control of the operation.

Other factors, however, were also present in this case. One of them was the mere objective fact that World War I had worked a great hardship on Baptists in Europe. When the German Baptists in America responded to the need for assistance, they found it so great that it consumed all of their contributions to foreign missions. And since the ABFMS itself did not reenter that field after the War, it encouraged the Germans to do so, even though it know that the result would be a sharp reduction in their giving to heathen missions.[1] Through this experience the German Baptists were also awakened to the psychological and promotional advantages of having their own foreign missions.[2]

It would appear, therefore, that such ethnic tensions as were created by the War were not the major contributing factor, despite the fact that the parting of the ways followed in the early 1920's. In fact, with their ties to Europe cut by the War, German Baptists diverted more of their missionary giving to the ABFMS during the War then at any time before or since.[3] Besides, they had taken more steps toward independence in foreign missions during the first decade of the century, when ethnic relations with the American Baptists were at their best, then immediately

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1898, 8th App.; ibid., 1922, p. 29.

[2] Ibid., 1922, p. 27. [3] Ibid., 1925, p. 39.

[4] E.g., DS, May 11, 1918, p. 3; ibid., April 30, 1919, p. 2.

following the War.

One of the last institutional ties to be severed was that between Rochester Theological Seminary and its German department. Since early in its history the German Department had been given considerable autonomy in matters of policy and administration. It had its own School Committee to regulate academic matters and Board of Trustees to supervise its finances. After the completion of the $100,000 endowment, it was also, for the most part, financially self-supporting. Only legally it was still a branch of the English seminary, which administered its endowments, appointed its professors, and generally had ultimate authority over its operation.[1] But in 1940 that too was changed. These last bonds were sufficiently modified for the former German Department to consider itself independent. It assumed a separate name, elected its own president, and its "Board of Trustees assumed almost all of the responsibilities which are involved in the operation of an educational institution."[2]

Financial considerations again played a vital part in effecting these changes. As in the case of the home mission societies, however, it was as much the result of the American Baptist institution trying to unload its German auxiliary as it was of the latter becoming self-sufficient. As has already been shown, Rochester Theological Seminary literally forced the German Department to become more self-supporting

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1922, pp. 16-7; ibid., 1931, pp. 51-5.

[2] George A. Lang, ed., Alumni Directory (Sioux Falls; North American Baptist Seminary, 1971), p. 109. See also Verh. (Gen.), 1940, pp. 34-5.

XUM

during the 1890's. Finding this department an unbearable financial burden and considering that it was practically independent in government and discipline, President A. H. Strong concluded back in 1893, "It will be better off if compelled to go alone."[1] Still unable to assume the entire cost of the school, it was the Germans who literally pleaded for a continuation of the relationship.

Before the next major change in the relationship of the two departments in 1940, it was again the parent institution which initiated the negotiations. Because of the greatly decreased yield from its invested funds during the depression, it requested to be relieved of some of its financial obligation to the German Department.[2] Being prepared to carry the additional financial burden this time, the Germans agreed, but also negotiated for and gained more autonomy in the bargain.

As important as the growing self-sufficiency of the German Baptists was in contributing to their institutional separation from the American Baptists, it was not the only reason. The relationship of the German churches to American Baptists associations and state conventions, and after 1908 to the Northern Baptist Convention, was basically ecclesiastical and not financial. Yet it, too, waned, was seriously contravened in 1940, and has dwindled into insignificance since. The severance of financial ties affected these ecclesiastical relationships but did not prevent them. There is no reason why the Germans could not have been assimilated into the Anglo-American denomination despite their

---

[1] NYBUME, An. Rep., 1893, p. 34. See also DS, May 24, 1899, p. 329.

[2] Verh. (Gen.), 1940, pp. 34-5.

XUM

financial independence.

As a result of many years of cooperation in home missions, foreign missions, and ministerial education, the German churches were drawn into a closer relationship with the larger denomination. Damaging suspicions and other barriers to fellowship were generally being overcome. The German Baptist General Missionary Secretary somewhat overstated the case when he said that "they are a part of the great denomination, in full sympathy with it, participating in all its great interests."[1] But by the turn of the century the majority of them were members of American Baptist associations as well as of their own.[2]

In 1913 the General Conference of the German churches assured a representative of the Northern Baptist Convention that it would remain an integral part of the larger body and not become a distinct denomination.[3] Similarly, in 1919 the General Missionary Society agreed to a home missions plan which was intented to draw its churches into closer touch and relationship to American Baptist state conventions.[4] And as late as 1940 there were those who strongly argued that the Germans had completed their mission and should consummate their organic union with the English-speaking Baptists, dissolving their own separate organizations. Many dually alligned churches were fully prepared for the transition.[5]

---

[1] BHMM, Feb. 1897, p. 59. See also ibid., Jan. 1896, p. 31.

[2] Ibid., Sept. 1898, p. 305. [3] Missions, Nov. 1913, p. 846.

[4] DS, May 14, 1919, p. 8. [5] Kuhn, op. cit., p. 259.

These ecclesiastical relationships, however, were not to last either. For in 1940 the German Baptist General Conference unanimously moved to decline an invitation to become an associate member of the Northern Baptist Convention.[1] That resolution, admittedly, was less than an explicit declaration of independence. Churches which were dually alligned were not prevented from continuing in that relationship.[2] Nor did it entirely preclude any future institutional assimilation at the top level; some astute observers continued to regard the future course of the denomination as an open question. It nevertheless represented a refusal to take even a minute step toward the American Baptists' century-long objective for the mission,[3] and in retrospect it can be seen as the point from which the dominant sentiment among the German Baptists was clearly to remain a distinct denomination.

The major reason for this action seems to lie in a combination of ecclesiastical and sociological considerations. The decentralized nature of Baptist polity, for instance, made it possible for the German churches to establish their own ecclesiastical organizations in the first place and prevented the parent body from effecting their ultimate assimilation. German Methodists and Presbyterians in this country were permitted to organize their own ecclesiastical entities as well, but in those cases

---

[1] Verh. (Gen.), 1940, p. 12.

[2] Some continue in it to this day.

[3] The new relationship would have entitled the German Baptist General Conference to a representative in the General Council of the Northern Baptist Convention without any financial obligations or any abridgement of the former's independence (Verh. [Gen.], 1940, p. 12).

the English body retained more control over the foreign-speaking ones during the period of their separate existence and were able to bring more pressure to bear on them when it was deemed time for them to be assimilated.[1] The fact that the American Baptists of the North themselves had not organized as a denomination until 1908 did not help matters either. The Southern Baptist Convention, for instance, kept much tighter control over foreign-speaking churches in its jurisdiction.[2] Consequently, in the case under study the final decision to assimilate or not to assimilate was a strictly voluntary decision left to the group that was to dissolve itself and to be assumed by another. Probably only some pressing need would have prompted such action.

Meanwhile, several sociological factors increasingly militated against such a decision as well. By 1940, when it appeared most natural for the Germans to yield to assimilation, they had acquired their own churches, associations, conferences, missionary society, and seminary. These were not only their own but were in large part that which constituted their self-identity. The natural tendency for institutions to perpetuate themselves, therefore, in and of itself practically predetermined the 1940 General Conference decision.

Ownership further involved freedom and control. The various German Baptist ecclesiastical organizations had had considerable independence from the beginning. But achieving self-sufficiency and full independence

---

[1]Douglas, op. cit., chapter V; Fox, op. cit., chapter IX.

[2]Those German Baptists churches which cooperated with the Southern Baptist Convention in home missions were fully drawn into the Southern Baptist associations and state conventions (DS, Aug. 23, 1899, p. 533).

in home and foreign missions and in ministerial education had been a hard and long process. It would have been very difficult, therefore, to turn about and surrender these privileges so soon after acquiring them and after having poured so much "Kraft, Gut und Blut" into the effort.

What would have made the demise of the German Baptists even more difficult was their strong sense of purpose or mission. Besides sharing a common culture and faith, they had always deeply believed that it was their God-given responsibility to bring the evangelical message to their countrymen in America who were still unable to worship in English. Many years of common devotion to this task had closely knit them together and had created an esprit de corps which was hardly daunted by the need to discover a new purpose for their existence after World War I and is still vibrant to this day. Having discovered that such a common spirit promoted greater efficiency, the American Baptists even encouraged it for a time.[1] That did serve its purpose but at the same time also erected a further obstacle to disbanding the German organizations or merging them into another body.

Having their own organizations, constituted of people with a common heritage and given to a common purpose, also provided a sense of belonging and security which American Baptist churches could not match. Regardless of how well the German Baptists may have become Americanized, therefore, their own people would have remained sociologically and psychologically their primary group. To have chosen assimilation, therefore, would have been to voluntarily terminate their most meaningful

---

[1] Missions, Nov. 1913, p. 846.

XUM

relationship. That is not usually a voluntary decision.

American Baptists must accept some responsibility for these feeling as well. Despite all of their talk about Americanization and assimilation, they did not always genuinely accept the new Americans as equals. This is reflected, for example, in the following questions addressed to them in 1905:

> Honestly, what is your attitude towards the ordinary Immigrant? Do you want him and his family in your church? You prefer to have him in a mission by himself, do you not? Would you not rather work for him by proxy than with him in person? You do not like even to sit close to him in the street car, do you? Actual contact with him is apt to mean contamination--germs--physical ills. You desire his conversion--in the mission. You wish him well--at a distance.[1]

Such attitudes did not foster Americanization and certainly not assimilation.

With the benefit of hindsight, one can now clearly discern the emergence of these sentiments. As long as immigration from Germany remained strong and their immediate future was guaranteed, the German Baptists still spoke of eventually dissolving their separate institutions and becoming one with the American Baptists.[2] But when that immigration declined during the 1890's and the first decade of this century and the main reason for their existence was being undermined, they became apprehensive and defensive. To assure each other that the end had not yet arrived and to convince the American Baptists that the mission had to continue, they noted that, while immigration from Germany had diminished,

---

[1] BHMM, May 1905, p. 1. See also DS, July 8, 1896, p. 4.

[2] Examiner, Jan. 10, 1895, p. 13; ABHMS An. Rep., 1897, p. 115.

it was still continuing at a pace of several thousand per month. Moreover, first and second generation German-Americans alone had come to number from ten to twelve million. What an enormous field of labor! Of course not all of them were uncharched. From the perspective of the German Baptists, however, they were still regarded as only nominal Christians who needed to be won to biblical Christianity.

The continued expansion and success of the German churches also seemed to indicate that their task was still unfinished. During the first two decades of this century, they were constantly occupying new home and foreign mission fields, experiencing unprecedented numbers of assessions, and raising more funds per capita than American Baptists.[1]

No sooner had the German Baptists revived their sense of purpose, however, when World War I struck. With it all immigration from Germany was terminated. And due to cultural pressures, numerous churches adopted the use of the English language, many of them dissociating themselves entirely from the German conferences. If ever the future of the German Baptists looked bleak, it was then. At no other time in their history had they come as close to despairing and accepting assimilation.[2]

With their usual source of new members closed to them and with the rapidly extended use of English, they realized that their only hope for

---

[1] BHMM, Sept. 1898, p. 302; ibid., June 1901, p. 175; DS, Jan. 27, 1904, p. 57; ibid., Oct. 26, 1904, p. 680; ibid., Nov. 8, 1905, p. 713; ibid., May 2, 1906, pp. 274-6; Verh. (Gen.), 1907, 5th App., p. VII; DS, May 7, 1913, pp. 1-2; Missions, Jan. 1915, p. 21; DS, Oct. 4, 1916, p. 7.

[2] DS, Feb. 19, 1919, p. 7; ibid., Sept. 3, 1919, p. 2; ibid., Sept. 10, 1919, p. 8; ibid., Sept. 24, 1919, p. 9; ibid., Oct. 29, 1919, p. 7.

XUM

survival was to retain their young people, the bilingual churches, and even those churches which had become entirely English rather than relinquishing them to the American Baptists, as was expected. Not willing to die, they set about this task.[1]

In order to retain those churches that had introduced the use of English, the rest became more open to the need for bilingual and English churches, tried to be of more assistance to them, and attempted to dislodge the assumption that these churches needed to transfer their affiliation to the Northern Baptist Convention. The German Baptists stressed that with Germans still arriving from many European countries, with the prospects of immigration from Germany itself being renewed, and in view of their mission to other foreign-speaking peoples both at home and abroad, their special responsibility was still not accomplished and probably would continue for many more years. Nor should churches that had become English leave the German conferences for reason of the language alone. They still shared a common heritage, a common spirit, and a goal with the rest of the churches in those conferences.[2]

In an attempt to accommodate and retain the young people, the General Conference appointed two young ministers, specifically to promote young people's programs and Sunday school work. So vigorous and effective were their efforts that by 1932 the Sunday schools and young people's societies had become the major sources of new members for the churches.

---

[1] Ibid., April 30, 1919, p. 1; ibid., Sept. 3, 1919, p. 2; ibid., April 7, 1920, pp. 1-2.

[2] Ibid., May 14, 1919, p. 6; ibid., Sept. 10, 1919, p. 8; ibid., Oct. 29, 1919, p. 8; Verh. (Gen.), 1919. p. 6.

XUM

And not only were the vast majority of young people remaining with the denomination, but they showed keen interest in its program and a loyalty to its churches which gave overwhelming encouragement for the future of the denomination.[1]

At the same time, the denomination had not only been able to hold the churches that had introduced English but had become predominantly bilingual or English-speaking and even began to draw people who did not share their ethnic background, providing further hope for the future.[2]

Besides adding to its numbers, the denomination maintained, and probably even increased, a sense of loyalty and unity among its members. Realizing that its very existence was being threatened and that it could not be maintained without a clear sense of purpose, it consciously and intentionally set about the task of developing that needed characteristic. Numerous activities of the 1930's were clearly geared to this end, culminating with the appointment of a promotional secretary in 1937 and an unprecedented and intensive promotional campaign for the various denominational programs.[3]

In short, having come face to face with extinction, the German Baptists consolidated their forces, more clearly knit their organizations, and developed a vibrant _esprit de corps_. For these reasons, one might

---

[1] _Verh._ (Gen.), 1932, p. 63; _ibid._, 1934, p. 32; _ibid._, 1937, pp. 14, 36.

[2] _DS_, April 7, 1920, p. 2; _Minutes_, 1944, p. 30.

[3] E.g., _Verh._ (Gen.), 1934, pp. 13, 17, 18; _ibid._, 1937, pp. 10, 13; _ibid._, 1940, pp. 7, 22, 24; _Minutes_, 1944, pp. 23, 25, 57.

XUM

well have predicted the decision of the 1940 General Conference. By the time the Germans had finally become sufficiently Americanized for assimilation with the American Baptists, ecclesiastical and sociological circumstances had developed which prevented this long-awaited goal from being attained.

XUM

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

What is proposed here is only a brief statement concerning the nature and significance of the primary sources which were used most extensively for this study.

The American Baptist sources of greatest value for this investigation were the publications of the national societies most involved in the mission to German-Americans. And of these, the most important were the annual reports and official periodicals of the ABHMS (The Home Mission Record, 1849-62; The Home Evangelist, 1863-66; The Macedonian and Home Mission Record, 1867-72; The Baptist Home Mission Monthly, 1878-1909; and Missions, 1910-). As indicated in the body of the dissertation, it was the Home Mission Society which was most deeply involved in the German mission, and since it had its own official publications, other Baptist periodicals, such as The Examiner, The National Baptist, The Standard, and The Watchman-Examiner, gave only limited space to specifically home mission concerns and even less to home missions among foreign-speaking people.

The publications of the ABHMS are further valuable because they contain all kinds of information about the German mission; such only official decisions which had a bearing on the mission but also reports of its progress, promotional pieces (which reflect the motivations involved), evaluations of ongoing developments, and much more. Moreover,

XUM

they reflect not only the views of this one society but in measure also those of the denominational leaders generally. Since all the national American Baptist societies met in the same location each year, numerous prominent persons held membership and positions of leadership in two or more of the national societies. And since there was no national body representative of the entire denomination before 1907, these persons came closest to speaking for the denomination as a whole. Even in the years intervening the organization of the Northern Baptist Convention and the termination of the mission, the ABHMS continued to be the agency most responsible and involved in the mission.

Of course the annual reports of the NYBUME were also very useful because of the Union's long and extensive participation in the mission. Being the only regular publication of the Union and practically the only record of its activities further adds to their importance.

By far the most valuable primary source on the German Baptists is Der Sendbote. In fact, its importance can hardly be exaggerated. It was the only official denominational periodical for almost the entire period covered by this study. As such, it is clearly the major source of information about the denomination's life and thought. It reported everything from the issues affecting the denomination as a whole to the activities of the smallest groups in the most remote little churches and carried everything from the profoundest theological discussions of prominent thinkers to stories for children. Nor did it represent only one perspective. Throughout the period under consideration, it eagerly solicited written contributions from pastors and laymen reflecting all

of the major perspectives represented in the denomination. And as a family paper it carried sections on everything from devotional materials and foreign missions to market reports and health tips. The historian could hardly ask for a better primary source.

Also very useful are the minutes (Verhandlungen) of both the General Conference and the various regional conferences. They contain the annual reports of all the conferences' committees and agencies and records of the deliberations at conference sessions and of all official resolutions or decisions. In addition, they frequently summarized the addresses delivered at the conference sessions, carried excerpts from annual church reports sent to the conferences, and, for a time, included circular letters on pertinent issues prepared by the leading pastors.

Numerous other sources are available for the theology of the German Baptists. But, as indicated in the body of this study, theology did not become an issue of debate or conflict in the Americanization and assimilation of the German Baptists. American Baptists were more than pleased with the orthodoxy of the German body. Nor was there any one theology which could have been used as a criterion of Americanization after about the turn of the century.

XUM

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

Barnes, Mary C., and Barnes, Lemuel C. The New America: A Study in Immigration. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913.

Barnes, Lemuel C.; Barnes, Mary C.; and Stephenson, Edward M. Pioneers of Light: The First Century of the American Baptist Publication Society, 1824-1924. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, n.n.

Beaver, R. Pierce. "Missionary Motivation through Three Centuries." Reinterpretation in American Church History. Edited by Jerald C. Brauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Beecher, Lyman. Plea for the West. Cincinnati: Truman and Smith, 1835.

Billington, Ray A. The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1963.

Bogardus, Emory S. Essentials of Americanization. 3rd rev. ed. Los Angeles: Jesse Ray Miller, 1923.

Brooks, Charles A. Christian Americanization: A Task for the Churches. N.p.: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1919.

Brown, J. Newton. History of the American Baptist Publication Society, From its Origin in 1824, to its Thirty-Second Anniversary in 1856. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, n.d.

Burr, Nelson R. A Critical Bibliography of Religion in America. Vol. IV, Parts 1 and 2 of Religion in American Life. 4 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Donat, Rudolf. Das wachsende Werke; Ausbreitung der deutschen Baptistengemeinden durch sechzig Jahre, 1849 bis 1909. Kassel: J. G. Oncken, 1960.

_____. Wie das Werk Begann: Entstehung der deutschen Baptistengemeinden. Kassel: J. G. Oncken Verlag, 1958.

Douglass, Paul. "Bilingual Work and the Language Conferences." The History of American Methodism. Vol. II. Edited by Emory S. Burke. New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.

Douglass, Paul F. The Story of German Methodism: Biography of an Immigrant Soul. Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1939.

Dupree, Theodor. Ein Bahnbrecher für biblische Wahrheiten. Cassel, Germany: Verlag und Druck von Verlaghaus der deutschen Baptisten, 1900.

Eisenach, George J. A History of the German Congregational Churches in the United States. Yankton, S.D.: The Pioneer Press, 1938.

Elsbree, Oliver W. The Rise of the Missionary Spirit in America, 1790-1815. Williamsport, Pa.: Williamsport Printing Co., 1928.

Faust, Albert B. The German Element in the United States; With Special Reference to its Political, Moral, Social, and Educational Influence. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.

Foster, Charles I. An Errand of Mercy: The Evangelical United Front, 1790-1837. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

Fox, H. Clifford. German Presbyterianism in the Upper Mississippi Valley. Ypsilanti, Mich.: University Lithoprinters, 1942.

Gaustad, Edwin S. Historical Atlas of Religion in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.

Goodykoontz, Colin B. Home Missions on the American Frontier. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1939.

Gossett, Thomas F. Race: The History of an Idea in America. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Griffin, Clifford S. Their Brothers' Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1865. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1960.

Grose, Howard B. Aliens or Americans? New York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1906.

_____. Incoming Millions. New York: Fleming A. Revell Company, 1906.

Handlin, Oscar. The American People in the Twentieth Century. 2nd ed. rev. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

_____. The Uprooted. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951.

Handy, Robert T. The Protestant Quest for a Christian America, 1830-1930. Facet Books. Historical Series (American Church), Vol. 5. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

XUM

Hansen, Marcus L. The Immigrant in American History. Harper Torchbooks. Edited with a Foreword by Arthur M. Schlesinger. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1940.

Harkness, Georgia E. The Church and the Immigrant. Introduction by G. W. Tupper. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1921.

Hayes, Carlton J. H. A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941.

Heussi, Karl. Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte. 12th ed. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960.

Higham, John. Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955.

Hofstadter, Richard; Miller, William; and Aaron, Daniel. The United States: The History of a Republic. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

Hudson, Winthrop S. The Great Tradition of the American Churches. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

_____. Nationalism and Religion in America: Concepts of American Identity and Mission. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.

_____. Religion in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Jenk, Jeremiah W., Lauck, W. Jett. The Immigration Problem. 3rd ed. rev. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1913.

Judd, Bertha Grimmell. Fifty Golden Years: The First Half Century of the Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1877-1927. New York: The Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1927.

Krueger, Otto E. In God's Hand: The Story of the North American Baptist General Conference. Forest Park, Ill.: North American Baptist General Conference, 1958.

Kuhn, William, et. al. These Glorious Years: The Centenary History of German Baptists of North America 1843-1943. Cleveland: Roger Williams Press, n.d.

Leuschner, Martin L. "North American Baptist General Conference." Baptist Advance. Edited by Davis C. Woolley. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1964.

Littell, Franklin H. The Church and the Body Politic. New York: The Seabury Press, 1969.

Luckey, Hans. Johann Gerhard Oncken und die Anfänge des deutschen Baptismus. Cassel, Germany: Verlag von J. G. Oncken Nachf., 1934.

XUM

Maring, Norman H. American Baptists-- Whence and Whither. Valley Forge: The Judson Press, 1968.

Marty, Martin E. Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America. New York: The Dial Press, 1970.

May, Henry F. Protestant Churches and Industrial America. Harper Torchbooks New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1949.

McLanahan, Samuel. Our People of Foreign Speech. 2nd ed. New York: Presbyterian Home Missions, 1906.

McLoughlin, William G., ed. The American Evangelicals, 1800-1900. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.

Mead, Sidney E. The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

_____. "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America: 1607-1850." The Ministry in Historical Perspectives. Edited by H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1956.

Newman, Albert H., ed. A Century of Baptist Achievement. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1901.

_____. A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1915.

Nichols, James H. Democracy and the Churches. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951.

_____. History of Christianity, 1650-1950. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Kingdom of God in America. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1937.

_____. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. Meridian Books. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1929.

Olmstead, Clifton E. History of Religion in the United States. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Ramaker, Albert J. The German Baptists in North America: An Outline of their History. Cleveland: German Baptist Publication Society, 1924.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch. Cassel, Germany: Kommissionsverlag von J. G. Oncken Nachfolger, 1901.

XUM

Riis, Jacob. How the Other Half Lives. New York; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890.

Rushbrooke, J. H., ed. The Baptist Movement on the Continent of Europe. London: The Carey Press, 1915.

Schaff, Philip. America: A Sketch of Its Political, Social and Religious Character. Edited by Perry Miller. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961.

Schneider, Carl E. The German Church on the American Frontier: A Study in the Rise of Religion Among the Germans of the West . . . 1840-1866. St. Louis: Eden Publishing House, 1939.

Schulte, George A. Erinnerungen. Cleveland: Druck und Verlag des Publikation-Vereins der deutschen Baptisten, n.d.

Smith, Hilrie S.; Handy, Robert T.; and Loetscher, Lefferts A. America Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960-63.

Smith, Timothy L. Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.

Starr, Edward C. A Baptist Bibliography, Being a Register of Printed Material by and about Baptists; Including Works Written against the Baptists. Rochester: American Baptist Historical Society, 1947-.

Stevens, Daniel G. The First Hundred Years of the American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, n.d.

Strong, Josiah. Our Country, Its Possible Future and its Present Crisis. New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 1885.

Sweet, William W. The Story of Religion in America. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1950.

_____. Religion on the American Frontier: The Baptists 1783-1830. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1931.

Torbet, Robert G. A History of the Baptists. Rev. ed. Valley Forge: The Judson Press, 1950.

_____. The Baptist Story. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1957.

_____. Venture of Faith: The Story of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and the Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, 1814-1954. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1955.

Vedder, Henry C. A Short History of Baptist Missions. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1927.

_____. A Short History of the Baptists. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.

Wayland, Francis. The Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches. Edited by John H. Hinton. London: J. Heaton & Son, 1861.

White, Charles L. A Century of Faith. Philadelphia: The Judson Press for the American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1932.

Wittke, Carl. We Who Built America: The Saga of the Immigrant. Ann Arbor, Mich.: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1939.

Woolley, Davis C., ed. Baptist Advance. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1964.

PERIODICALS, PROCEEDINGS, ETC.

American Baptist Home Mission Society, Baptist Home Missions in North America . . . 1832-1882. New York: Baptist Home Mission Rooms, 1883.

American Baptist Publication Society. Annual Reports, 1853-1910.

Baptist Congress for the Discussion of Current Questions, Proceedings, 1882-1912.

The Baptist Herald, 1923-1945.

The Baptist Home Mission Monthly, 1878-1909.

Betteridge, Walter R; Ramaker, Albert J.; and Henderson, Josiah R. Rochester Theological Seminary General Catalogue, 1850 to 1900. Rochester: E. R. Andrews, Printer, 1900.

Die Biene auf dem Missionsfeld, 1860-1865.

Davis, Lawrence B. "The Baptist Response to Immigration in the United States, 1880-1925." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968.

Die deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden des Westens, Verhandlungen der Central-, Südwestlichen und Nordwestlichen Jahres-Konferenzen, 1880-1883.

Die deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nord Amerika. Verhandlungen der Bundes-Konferenzen, 1865-1940.

XUM

Die deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nordamerika. Verhandlungen der Jahres-Konferenzen, 1883-1944.

The Examiner, 1875-1913.

Executive Board. Annual Reports of the Executive Committee of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1832-1920.

Gaustad, Edwin S. "Themes for Research in American Baptist History," Foundations, VI (April, 1963).

"General Catalogue, 1819-1930," Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin, III (Oct., 1930).

The Home Evangelist, 1863-1866.

Home Mission Bulletin, 1901.

Home Mission Echoes, 1897-1908.

The Home Mission Record, 1849-1862.

Die Konferenzen von deutschen Baptisten-Gemeinden des Westens. Verhandlungen, 1859-1880.

Landis, Benson Y., ed. Yearbook of American Churches. Lebanon, Pa.: Sowers Printing Company, 1945.

Lang, George A., Comp. and ed. Alumni Directory: North American Baptist Seminary. Sioux Falls, S.D.: North American Baptist Seminary, 1971.

The Macedonian and Home Mission Record, 1867-1872.

Missions, 1910-1920.

Der Mitarbeiter, 1874-1878.

Mol, Johannes J. "Churches and Immigrants: A Sociological Study of the Mutual Effect of Religion and Immigrant Adjustment." R.E.M.P. Bulletin, IX (May 1961), Supplement 5.

Moore, LeRoy. "The Rise of American Religious Liberalism at the Rochester Theological Seminary, 1872-1928. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1966.

The National Baptist, 1880-1894.

New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education. Annual Reports with the Proceedings of the Annual Meetings. 1850-1927.

XUM

North American Baptist General Conference. Minutes. 1944-1946.

Die Östlichen Konferenzen deutscher Baptisten-Gemeinden von Nordamerika. Verhandlungen, 1851-1883.

Ohlmann, Eric H. "A Historical Study of the Influence of Pietistic Thought on the North American Baptist General Conference During its Formative Years, 1839-1883." Unpublished Th.M. thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966.

Pennsylvania Baptist Convention, Minutes, 1840-1850.

Ramaker, Albert J. "The Story of the German Department." Rochester Theological Seminary Bulletin, (Oct. 1927), 30-46.

_____. "Das Theologische Seminar der Deutschen Baptisten: Fünfundsiebzigstes Jubiläum, 1852-1927." Rochester: n.p., 1927. (Pamphlet.)

Schulte, J. A. "Geschichte der Ersten Deutschen Baptisten Gemeinde zu Philadelphia, Pa.," Philadelphia: n.p., 1893. (Typewritten.)

Der Sendbote, 1853-1922.

The Standard, 1878-1920.

The Watchman-Examiner, 1913- 1920.

XUM